arXiv:1405.3386v2 [math.DG] 16 May 2015

SEEING THROUGH SPACETIME

YAROSLAV KURYLEV, MATTI LASSAS, GUNTHER UHLMANN

Abstract: *We study two inverse problems on a globally hyperbolic Lorentzian manifold (M, g). We consider measurements done in a neighborhood V of a time-like, future directed geodesic μ that connects p^- to p^+. The studied problems are:*

1. Active measurements in spacetime: We consider inverse problems for non-linear hyperbolic equations and develop a method that utilizes the non-linearity as a benefit. The method is demonstrated for the non-linear wave equation $\Box_g u + au^2 = F$. We consider the source-to-solution map $L_V : F \to u|_V$ that maps the source F supported on V to the restriction of the solution u on V. When M is 4-dimensional, we show that the set V, the metric $g|_V$ on it, and the map L_V determine the topological, differentiable, and conformal structures of the spacetime in the maximal set where waves can propagate from μ and return back to μ. We use the non-linearity of the wave equation to reduce the problem of active measurements to passive measurements.

2. Passive observations in spacetime: We assume that we are given V, $g|_V$, and the light observations sets $\mathcal{P}_V(q)$ corresponding to all (or a dense subset of) source points q in $W \subset M$. The light observation set $\mathcal{P}_V(q)$ is the intersection of V and the light-cone emanating from the point q. When $W \subset M$ is a relatively compact, connected, open set which all points are in the chronological past of the point p^+ but not in the past of the point p^-, we show that the given data determine the conformal type of $(W, g|_W)$. Under assumption that the space-time is Ricci-flat we can also determine the whole metric tensor in W.

The methods developed here have the potential to be applied to a large class of inverse problems for non-linear hyperbolic equations encountered in various practical imaging problems and other problems in mathematical physics.

Keywords: Inverse problems, Lorentzian manifolds, non-linear hyperbolic equations.

Contents

1. Introduction and main results 2
1.1. Inverse problem for passive observations 3
1.2. Inverse problems for active measurements 7
2. Earliest observation time functions 13

Date: May 16, 2015.

2.1. Preliminary constructions 13
2.2. Observation time representation of a Lorentzian manifold 18
3. Inverse problem for active measurements 24
3.1. Asymptotic expansion for the non-linear wave equation 24
3.2. Linear wave equation and distorted plane waves 25
3.3. Microlocal analysis of the non-linear interaction of waves 29
3.4. Non-vanishing interaction in the Minkowski space 41
3.5. Detection of singularities 45
4. Determination of the earliest light observation sets 47
4.1. Surfaces of the earliest singularities 47
4.2. Step-by-step construction of the spacetime 50
5. Solution of the inverse problem for passive observations 56
5.1. Construction of the differentiable structure 56
5.2. Construction of the conformal type of the metric 61
References 64

1. Introduction and main results

We study the question of whether an observer in spacetime can determine the structure of the surrounding spacetime by doing measurements near its world line? We consider two kinds of problems: inverse problems for active measurements and for passive observations.

For active measurements, we consider the wave equation

$$\begin{aligned} &\Box_g u(x) + a(x)\, u(x)^2 = f(x) \quad \text{on } M_0, \\ &\qquad u(x) = 0, \quad \text{outside causal future of supp}\,(f), \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

on the Lorentzian manifold (M_0, g), a future-pointing time-like geodesic $\widehat{\mu} = \widehat{\mu}([-1,1]) \subset M_0$ and an open neighborhood V of $\widehat{\mu}$. The wave equation is considered as a model problem for which we demonstrate the new techniques we develop. We will consider in a follow up paper the Einstein equations coupled with scalar fields with applications to general relativity and other physical models involving non-linear hyperbolic equations, see [48]. We assume that we can control sources supported in V and measure the physical fields in the same set V. Our aim is to determine the conformal class of the metric (or even the metric tensor in some cases) in a suitable larger set $J = J^+(p^-) \cap J^-(p^+)$, $p^\pm = \widehat{\mu}(s_\pm)$, see Fig. 1(Left). We study the inverse problem for active measurements by considering the interaction of distorted plane wave packets (Fig. 1, Right) reducing the problem to the problem for passive observations, see Section 1.2 of the introduction for more details.

The inverse problem for passive observations means the reconstruction of a region W of a Lorentzian manifold from light observation sets $\mathcal{P}_V(q)$ corresponding to points $q \in W$. The light observation set $\mathcal{P}_V(q)$ is the intersection of set V and the future light cone ${}^+(q)$ emanating

from the source point q. Physically, this corresponds to the case of a passive observer, who registers in the set V light (or a gravitational wave) coming from a source at q. Due to the existence of conjugate points (or physically speaking, gravitational lensing or Einstein rings) such observations can by strongly distorted. Under appropriate conditions, we first show that W can be reconstructed as a topological manifold from these data. After that, we show that the differentiable structure of W and the conformal class of $g|_W$ can be reconstructed.



FIGURE 1. **Left:** *This is a schematic figure in* $\mathbb{R}^{1+1}$. *The black vertical line is the freely falling observer* $\widehat{\mu}$ *and contains the points* p^- *and* p^+. *The neighborhood* V *of* $\widehat{\mu}$ *is marked by a blue curve. The black "diamond" is the set* $J = J(p^-, p^+) = J^+(p^-) \cap J^-(p^+)$.

Right: *This is a schematic figure in the space* $\mathbb{R}^3$. *It describes the location of a distorted plane wave (or a piece of a spherical wave)* u_1 *at different time moments. This wave propagates near a light-like geodesic* $\gamma_{x_0,\zeta_0}((0,\infty)) \subset \mathbb{R}^{1+3}$, $x_0 = (y_0, t_0)$ *and is singular on a subset of a light cone emanating from* $x' = (y', t')$. *The black line segment is the projection of* $\gamma_{x_0,\zeta_0} \subset \mathbb{R}^{1+3}$ *in to* $\mathbb{R}^3$. *The piece of the distorted plane wave is sent from the surface* $\Sigma \subset \mathbb{R}^3$, *and at a later time its singular support is the surface* Σ_1.

1.1. **Inverse problem for passive observations.** To formulate the results, we first introduce some definitions. Let (M, g) be a n-dimensional Lorentzian manifold of signature $(1, n-1)$, $n \geq 3$. In this paper we assume that (M, g) is time-oriented so that we can define future and past pointing time-like and causal paths. For $p, q \in M$ we denote $p \ll q$ if $p \neq q$ and there is a future pointing time-like path from p to q. We denote $p < q$, if $p \neq q$ and there is a future pointing causal path from p to q and denote $p \leq q$ when either $p = q$ or $p < q$. The chronological future of $p \in M$ is the set $I^+(p) = \{q \in M;\ p \ll q\}$. the causal future of p is the set $J^+(p) = \{q \in M;\ p \leq q\}$. Similarly, we introduce the chronological past, $I^-(p)$, and the causal past, $J^-(p)$, see [63]. Note that $I^\pm(p)$ are always open. For a set $A \subset M$ we denote

$J^{\pm}(A) = \cup_{p\in A} J^{\pm}(p)$. We also denote $J(p,q) := J^+(p) \cap J^-(q)$ and $I(p,q) := I^+(p) \cap I^-(q)$. If we need to emphasize the metric g which is used to define the causality, we denote $J^{\pm}(p)$ by $J^{\pm}_g(p)$ etc.

By [8], a time-orientable Lorentzian manifold (M,g) is globally hyperbolic if and only if there are no closed causal paths in M and for all $q_1, q_2 \in M$ such that $q_1 < q_2$ the set $J(q_1,q_2) \subset M$ is compact. Roughly speaking the last property means that M has no naked singularities which one could reach by moving along a time-like path starting from a point q^- and ending in a point q^+. By Y. Choquet-Bruhat, the strong cosmic censorship hypothesis can in loose terms be stated as: "[A]ll reasonable Einsteinian spacetimes ought to be globally hyperbolic" [12, p. 422]. In particular, this condition is needed to make the hyperbolic equations on (M,g) well posed.

We assume throughout the paper that (M,g) is globally hyperbolic. In this case, $J^{\pm}(p)$ are closed and $\mathrm{cl}(I^{\pm}(p)) = J^{\pm}(p)$. To the knowledge of the authors, it is not presently known if there exist homeomorphic 4-dimensional, globally hyperbolic, Lorentzian manifolds that are not diffeomorphic but they are known to exist in higher dimensions, see [11]. The topology of such manifolds, even with asymptotically flat vacuum spacetimes can be very complicated, [40, 41].



Figure 2. Left: *The future light cone $\mathcal{L}^+(q)$ from the point q is shown as a red cone. The point q is the tip of the cone. The observation set V is shown in blue. The light observation point set $\mathcal{P}_V(q)$ with a point source at q is the intersection $\mathcal{L}^+(q) \cap V$.* **Middle:** *In Thm. 1.2, we consider a set $W \subset I^-(p^+) \setminus J^-(p^-)$. The boundary of W is shown in the figure as a black curve. The red line is a light ray from a point $q \in W$ that is observed in the blue set V. These observations are shown to determine W as a differentiable manifold and the conformal class of the metric on it.* **Right:** *The black curves are the paths μ_{a_j} and the red curves are light-like geodesics from q. Some light rays intersect μ_{a_j} at $p_j = \mu_{a_j}(f^+_{a_j}(q))$ before their cut points, but light-rays from q may intersect a geodesic μ_a after their cut points. For any $q_0 \in W$ we can find $a_j \in \mathcal{A}$, $j = 1, 2, \ldots, n$ and a neighborhood of q_0 where the observation time functions $q \mapsto f^+_{a_j}(q)$ define a smooth coordinate system.*

Let $L_pM = \{\xi \in T_pM \setminus \{0\};\ g(\xi,\xi) = 0\}$. Also, $L_p^+M \subset L_pM$ and $L_p^-M \subset L_pM$ denote the future and the past light-like vectors in T_pM.

Let $\exp_q : T_qM \to M$ be the exponential map on (M,g). The geodesic starting at p in the direction $\xi \in T_pM \setminus \{0\}$ is the curve $\gamma_{p,\xi}(t) = \exp_p(\xi t)$, $t \geq 0$. We also denote

$$^+(x) = \exp_x(L_x^+M) \cup \{x\} = \{\gamma_{q,\xi}(t) \in M;\ \xi \in L_q^+M,\ t \geq 0\} \subset M$$

the union of the image of the future light-cone in the exponential map of (M,g) and the point x.

Let $\widehat{\mu} : [-1,1] \to M$ be a smooth future pointing time-like geodesic and $V \subset M$ be an open neighborhood of $\widehat{\mu}([-1,1])$.

1.1.1. *The set of earliest light observations.* Let $s_-, s_+ \in (-1,1)$, $s_- < s_+$, and $p^\pm = \widehat{\mu}(s_\pm)$.

Next define the light observation sets and consider in particular the case when $W \subset I^-(p^+) \setminus J^-(p^-)$ is a relatively compact open set, see Fig. 2 (Middle).

Definition 1.1. *(i) The light observation set of $q \in M$ is*

$$\mathcal{P}_V(q) = \mathcal{L}_q^+ \cap V \in 2^V.$$

(ii) The earliest light observation set of $q \in M$ in V is

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{E}_V(q) = \{x \in \mathcal{P}_V(q) :\ &\text{there are no } y \in \mathcal{P}_V(q) \text{ and}\\ &\text{future-pointing time-like path } \alpha : [0,1] \to V\\ &\text{such that } \alpha(0) = y \text{ and } \alpha(1) = x\} \subset V\end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

(iii) Let $W \subset M$ be open. The collection of the earliest light observation sets with source points at W is

$$\mathcal{E}_V(W) = \{\mathcal{E}_V(q);\ q \in W\} \subset 2^V. \tag{3}$$

Note $\mathcal{E}_V(W)$ is defined as an unindexed set, that is, for an element $\mathcal{E}_V(q) \in \mathcal{E}_V(W)$ we do not know what is the corresponding point q.

Above, $2^V = \{V';\ V' \subset V\}$ is the power set of V. Below, when $\Phi : V_1 \to V_2$ is a map, we say that the power set extension of Φ is the map $\widetilde{\Phi} : 2^{V_1} \to 2^{V_2}$ given by $\widetilde{\Phi}(V') = \{\Phi(z);\ z \in V'\}$ for $V' \subset V_1$. Below, when we say that the set V is given as a differentiable manifold, we mean that we are given the set V and the local coordinate charts on it for which the corresponding transition maps are C^∞-smooth.

Inverse problem with passive observations: We assume that we are given the set V as a differentiable manifold, the conformal class of the metric $g|_V$ on V, and the collection of the earliest light observation sets $\mathcal{E}_V(W) = \{\mathcal{E}_V(q) \subset V;\ q \in W\}$, where $W \subset I^-(p^+) \setminus J^-(p^-)$ is a relatively compact open set. The inverse problem is whether these data determine the set W as a differentiable manifold and the conformal class of the metric $g|_W$.

Below we will show that the earliest light observation set $\mathcal{E}_V(q)$ determine uniquely the point $q \in W$. Note that this is not true for an arbitrary set in $J^-(p^+)$. For example, if M is the Lorentzian manifold $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}^3$, x_1 and x_2 are antipodal points on the 3-sphere $\mathbb{S}^3$ and $V \subset (-T, \infty) \times \mathbb{S}^3$, we see that for the points $q_1 = (t, x_1)$ and $q_2 = (t - \pi, x_2)$, $t < -T$ we have $\mathcal{E}_V(q_1) = \mathcal{E}_V(q_2)$.

A map $\Psi : (V_1, g_1) \to (V_2, g_2)$ is a conformal diffeomorphism if $\Psi : V_1 \to V_2$ is a diffeomorphism and $\Psi_* g_1 = e^{2f(x)} g_2(x)$ for some scalar function $f(x)$. The following theorem implies that the collection $\mathcal{E}_V(W)$ of the earliest light observation sets determines uniquely the conformal type of $(W, g|_W)$. In fact, it is enough to know the earliest light observation sets $\mathcal{E}_V(q)$ for a dense subset of points q in W, see Remark 2.2 in Section 2.2.

Theorem 1.2. *Let (M_j, g_j), $j = 1, 2$ be two open, C^∞-smooth, globally hyperbolic Lorentzian manifolds of dimension $n \geq 3$ and let $p_j^+, p_j^- \in M_j$ be the points of a time-like geodesic $\widehat{\mu}_j([-1, 1]) \subset M_j$, $p_j^\pm = \widehat{\mu}_j(s_\pm)$. Let $V_j \subset M_j$ be a neighborhood of $\widehat{\mu}_j([-1, 1])$ of the form (11) and $W_j \subset M_j$ be relatively compact sets such that $\overline{W}_j \subset J^-(p_j^+) \setminus I^-(p_j^-)$. Let $\mathcal{E}_{V_j}(W_j)$ be the collections of the earliest light observations sets of the points in the set W_j on the manifold (M_j, g_j), see (3). Assume that there is a conformal diffeomorphism $\Phi : V_1 \to V_2$ such that $\Phi(\widehat{\mu}_1(s)) = \widehat{\mu}_2(s)$, $s \in [-1, 1]$ and the power set extension $\widetilde{\Phi}$ of Φ satisfies*

$$\widetilde{\Phi}(\mathcal{E}_{V_1}(W_1)) = \mathcal{E}_{V_2}(W_2). \tag{4}$$

Then there is a diffeomorphism $\Psi : W_1 \to W_2$ such that the metric $\Psi^* g_2$ is conformal to g_1 and $\Psi|_{W_1 \cap V_1} = \Phi|_{W_1 \cap V_1}$.

When M_j, $j = 1, 2$, have significant Ricci-flat parts, Theorem 1.2 can be strengthened.

Corollary 1.3. *Assume that (M_j, g_j) and V_j, W_j, $j = 1, 2$ satisfy the conditions of Theorem 1.2 with the resulting conformal map $\Psi : W_1 \to W_2$ as in Theorem 1.2. Moreover, assume that W_j are Ricci-flat. Also, assume that all components of W_j intersect V_j, $j = 1, 2$. Then the map Ψ is an isometry.*

Idea of the proof of Theorem 1.2. The proof is given in Section 2 where the topological structure of W is reconstructed and in Section 5 where the differentiable structure of W and the conformal type of the metric $g|_W$ are reconstucted. We will define a suitable smaller observation set $U \subset V$ and consider the collection $\mathcal{E}_U(W)$. The idea is to endow the set $\mathcal{E}_U(W) \subset 2^U$ with a Lorentzian manifold structure that makes it conformal to W. To sketch the idea of the proof, we assume for simplicity that the manifold (M, g) has not conjugate points or cut points and that $U \cap W = \emptyset$. Then, any light-like geodesic segment γ_0 in the light-cone ${}^+(q)$, i.e., $\gamma_0 \subset {}^+(q)$, can be extended to a geodesic

$\widetilde{\gamma}_1$ that goes through the point q. Let us consider a light-like geodesic segment $\gamma_1 \subset U$ and define $\Theta(\gamma_1)$ to be the set of the elements $\mathcal{E}_U(q) \in \mathcal{E}_U(W)$ for which $\gamma_1 \subset \mathcal{E}_U(q)$. Then, when γ_1 is continued to a maximal geodesic $\widetilde{\gamma}_1 \subset M$, we have that $\Theta(\gamma_1)$ is the image of the geodesic segment $\widetilde{\gamma}_1 \cap W$ in the map $q \mapsto \mathcal{E}_U(q)$. This means that on the set $\mathcal{E}_U(W)$ we can see images of the light-like geodesics of M that intersect U. Using this we can show that the map $\mathcal{E}_U : q \mapsto \mathcal{E}_U(q)$ is one-to-one and defines a homeomorphism $\mathcal{E}_U : W \mapsto \mathcal{E}_U(W)$. In this way we reconstruct the topological structure of W. The differentiable structure can be reconstructed by using the earliest observation time functions $f_a^+(q)$. The function $f_a^+(q)$ is equal to the smallest parameter value s for which $\mu_a(s)$ belongs in the light-cone $^+(q)$ emanating from $q \in W$. We show that the suitably chosen functions $q \mapsto f_a^+(q)$ can be as local coordinate functions in W. Finally, we use the observation that there is an open set of directions $\xi \in L_q^+M$ satisfying the image $\Theta(\gamma_1) \subset \mathcal{E}_U(W)$ can be constructed for a geodesic $\widetilde{\gamma}_1 \subset M$ such that $\widetilde{\gamma}_1(0) = q$ and $\partial_s\widetilde{\gamma}_1(0) = \xi$. This implies that we can construct the range $\mathcal{E}_U(\Gamma)$ of an open subset Γ of the light-cone L_q^+M in the differential of the map $\mathcal{E}_U$. Further, these open sets determine the range $\mathcal{E}_U(L_q^+M)$ of the light-cone for all $q \in W$. Using this we reconstruct the conformal class of $g|_W$. For a general manifold that may have conjugate points or cut points the above constructions become more technical and are heavily based on the fact that any longest curve connecting two points on a Lorentzian manifold is a geodesic and the fact that on a globally hyperbolic manifold M any points $p, q \in M$ satisfying $p < q$ can be connected with a causal geodesic.

1.2. **Inverse problems for active measurements.** For active measurements, (M, g) be a 4-dimensional Lorentzian manifold of signature $(1, 3)$. We develop a new method to solve inverse problems for non-linear hyperbolic equations. We demonstrate this method for for a particular non-linear wave equation, the quadratic Klein-Gordon equation with a time-depending metric.

1.2.1. *Inverse problem for the non-linear wave equation.* The solution of inverse problems is often done by constructing the coefficients of the equations using invariant methods, e.g. using travel time coordinates. Many geometric inverse problems are formulated invariantly, that is, on manifolds, see e.g. [2, 7, 19, 21, 26, 27, 52]. Several physical models lead to non-linear differential equations. In small perturbations, these equations can be approximated by linear equations, and most of the previous results on hyperbolic inverse problems in the multi-dimensional case with vanishing initial data concern linear models. Moreover, the existing uniqueness results are limited to the time-independent or real-analytic coefficients [2, 6, 7, 21, 45] since these results are based on

Tataru's unique continuation theorem [76, 77]. Such unique continuation results have been shown to fail for general metric tensors which are not analytic in the time variable [1]. Also, the studies of inverse problems for hyperbolic equations with time-dependent coefficients that are based on other methods have been restricted to the case when only the lower order terms depend on time, see [71, 73], the monographs [64, 69] and the references therein.

Even some linear inverse problem are not uniquely solvable. In fact, counterexamples for these problems have been based on the so-called transformation optics. This has led to models for fixed frequency invisibility cloaks, see e.g. [30, 31] and references therein. These applications give one more motivation to study the uniqueness of inverse problems.

Earlier studies on inverse problems for non-linear equations have concerned parabolic equations [38], elliptic equations [39, 43, 74, 75], and 1-dimensional hyperbolic equations [61]. The present paper differs from the earlier studies in that in our approach we do not consider the non-linearity as a perturbation, whose effect is small, but as a tool that helps us solve the inverse problem for multidimensional non-linear wave equations with vanishing initial data and time-dependent coefficients. Indeed, it is the non-linearity that makes it possible to solve a non-linear inverse problem which linearized version is not yet solved. This is the key novel feature of this paper.

1.2.2. *Notations.* Let (M, g) be a C^∞-smooth $(1+3)$-dimensional globally hyperbolic Lorentzian manifold, where the metric signature of g is $(-,+,+,+)$.

By [9], the globally hyperbolic manifold (M, g) has an isometry Φ to the smooth product manifold $(\mathbb{R} \times N, h)$, where N is a 3-dimensional manifold and the metric h can be written as

$$h = -\beta(t, y)dt^2 + \kappa(t, y). \tag{5}$$

Here $\beta : \mathbb{R} \times N \to (0, \infty)$ is a smooth function and $\kappa(t, \cdot\,)$ is a Riemannian metric on N depending smoothly on $t \in \mathbb{R}$, and the submanifolds $\{t'\} \times N$ are C^∞-smooth Cauchy surfaces for all $t' \in \mathbb{R}$. We define the smooth time function $\mathbf{t} : M \to \mathbb{R}$ by setting $\mathbf{t}(x) = t$ if $\Phi(x) \in \{t\} \times N$. Let us next identify these isometric manifolds, that is, we denote $M = \mathbb{R} \times N$.

For $t \in \mathbb{R}$, let $M(t) = (-\infty, t) \times N$ and, for a fixed $t_0 > 0$,

$$M_0 = M(t_0) = (-\infty, t_0) \times N. \tag{6}$$

1.2.3. *Main result for the inverse problem for the non-linear wave equation.* Let $(M^{(j)}, g^{(j)})$, $j = 1, 2$ be two globally hyperbolic $(1 + 3)$ dimensional Lorentzian manifolds represented using global smooth time functions as $M^{(j)} = \mathbb{R} \times N^{(j)}$. Let $\widehat{\mu}_j = \widehat{\mu}_j([-1, 1]) \subset M^{(j)}$ be time-like geodesics and $V_j \subset M^{(j)}$ be an open, relatively compact neighborhood

of $\widehat{\mu}_j([s_-, s_+])$, $-1 < s_- < s_+ < 1$. Let $M_0^{(j)} = (-\infty, t_0) \times N^{(j)}$ where $t_0 > 0$ is such that $V_j \subset M_0^{(j)}$. Consider the non-linear wave equation

$$\begin{aligned} \Box_{g^{(j)}} u(x) + a_j(x)\, u(x)^2 &= f(x) \quad \text{on } M_0^{(j)}, \\ u(x) &= 0, \quad \text{for } x \in M_0^{(j)} \setminus J^+_{g^{(j)}}(\operatorname{supp}(f)), \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

where $\operatorname{supp}(f) \subset V_j$, $x = (x^0, x^1, x^2, x^3) = (t, x') \in \mathbb{R} \times N^{(j)}$, and

$$\Box_g u = \sum_{p,q=0}^{3} (-\det(g))^{-1/2} \frac{\partial}{\partial x^p} \left((-\det(g))^{1/2} g^{pq} \frac{\partial}{\partial x^q} u(x) \right),$$

$\det(g) = \det((g_{pq}(x))_{p,q=0}^3)$. Here, $f \in C_0^6(V_j)$ is a controllable source, and a_j is a nowhere vanishing C^∞-smooth function. The local existence results for the non-linear hyperbolic equations imply that the equation (7) has a unique solution when f is in a sufficiently small, see e.g. [12, 68].

Definition 1.4. *Let $\mathcal{W}_j \subset C_0^6(V_j)$ be a sufficiently small open neighborhood of the zero function. The source-to-field map $L_{V_j} : \mathcal{W}_j \to C(V_j)$, is the non-linear operator mapping the source f to restriction of the corresponding solution of the wave equation u in the observation domain V_j, that is,*

$$L_{V_j} : f \mapsto u|_{V_j}, \quad f \in \mathcal{W}_j \subset C_0^6(V_j), \tag{8}$$

where u satisfies the wave equation (7) on $(M_0^{(j)}, g^{(j)})$.

Below, $I(p_j^-, p_j^+) = I^+(p_j^-) \cap I^-(p_j^+)$ on $M^{(j)}$.

Inverse problem with active measurements: We assume that we are given the set V as a differentiable manifold and the source-to-field map $L_V : f \mapsto u|_V$. The inverse problem with active measurements is whether these data determine the set $I(p_j^-, p_j^+)$ as a differentiable manifold and the conformal class of the metric $g|_{I(p_j^-, p_j^+)}$. The set $I(p_j^-, p_j^+)$ is the maximal sets where the waves can propagated from $\widehat{\mu}([s_-, s_+])$ and return back to $\widehat{\mu}([s_-, s_+])$.

Our main result for the the inverse problem for the non-linear wave equation is the following:

Theorem 1.5. *Let $(M^{(j)}, g^{(j)})$, $j = 1, 2$ be two open, smooth, globally hyperbolic Lorentzian manifolds of dimension $(1+3)$ having the product structure $M^{(j)} = \mathbb{R} \times N^{(j)}$. Let $p_j^+ = \widehat{\mu}_j(s_+)$, $p_j^- = \widehat{\mu}_j(s_-) \in M^{(j)}$ be the points of the time-like geodesic $\widehat{\mu}_j = \widehat{\mu}_j([-1, 1]) \subset (-\infty, t_0) \times N_0^{(j)}$, $-1 < s_- < s_+ < 1$. Let $V_j \subset M^{(j)}$ be an open relatively compact neighborhood of $\widehat{\mu}_j([-1, 1])$. Let $a_j : M^{(j)} \to \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$, $j = 1, 2$ be nowhere vanishing C^∞-smooth functions.*

Let L_{V_j}, $j = 1, 2$ be source-to-field maps defined in open sets $\mathcal{W}_j \subset C_0^6(V_j)$ containing the zero function, see (8),

Assume that there is a diffeomorphism $\Phi : V_1 \to V_2$ *so that* $\Phi(p_1^-) = p_2^-$ *and* $\Phi(p_1^+) = p_2^+$ *and the source-to-field maps satisfy*

$$((\Phi^{-1})^* \circ L_{V_1} \circ \Phi^*) f = L_{V_2} f$$

for all $f \in \mathcal{W}$*, where* $\mathcal{W} \subset \mathcal{W}_2$ *is some neighborhood of the zero function in* $C_0^6(V_2)$*.*

Then there is a diffeomorphism $\Psi : I(p_1^-, p_1^+) \to I(p_2^-, p_2^+)$*, and the metric* $\Psi^* g^{(2)}$ *is conformal to* $g^{(1)}$ *in* $I(p_1^-, p_1^+) \subset M^{(1)}$*, that is, there is* $b : M^{(1)} \to \mathbb{R}_+$ *such that* $g^{(1)}(x) = b(x)(\Psi^* g^{(2)})(x)$ *in* $I(p_1^-, p_1^+)$*.*

Later, in Remark 3.1 we will see that the set V and the map L_V determine the metric tensor $g|_V$ in V.



FIGURE 3. Four plane waves propagate in space. When the planes intersect, the non-linearity of the hyperbolic system produces new waves. The four figures show the waves before the interaction of the waves start, when 2-wave interactions have started, when all 4 waves have just interacted, and later after the interaction. **Left:** *Plane waves before interacting.* **Middle left:** *The 2-wave interactions (red line segments) appear but do not cause new propagating singularities.* **Middle right and Right:** *All plane waves have intersected and new waves have appeared. The 3-wave interactions cause new conic waves (black surface). Only one such wave is shown in the figure. The 4-wave interaction causes a point source in spacetime that sends a spherical wave in all future light-like directions. This spherical wave is essential in our considerations. For an animation on these interactions, see the supplementary video* [82].

Outline of the proof of Theorem 1.5. The proof is given in Sections 2,3, and 4. In Sec. 2 we give preparatory geometrical results to estimate the locations of cut and conjugate points along geodesics and introduce the concepts of first observation time functions. In Sections 3 and 4 we use the non-linearity to reduce the studied inverse problem to an inverse source problem for a linear wave equation. In particular, we are interested in constructing "artificial point sources" in the spacetime. This is done by interacting four distorted plane waves. Using the new waves produced by such point sources we can determine the earliest

light observation set and use Theorem 1.2. For the details, see Sections 3-4.

As noted above, the interaction of the distorted plane waves are difficult to analyze if the waves have caustics. By using global Lorentzian geometry (in Sec. 2) we give in Sec. 4 give conditions that ensure that no caustics affect the earliest observations obtained from the interaction of four colliding, distorted plane waves when these waves are produced by appropriate sources and the collision of the waves is observed before a certain time. We use this in Sec. 4 to give a step-by-step construction of the earliest light observations corresponding to points q in the diamond set $I(p^-, p^+)$. After this the topological, differentiable, and conformal structures in $I(p^-, p^+)$ can be reconstructed using Theorem 1.2.

In this paper we present the complete proofs of the results, but mention for the convenience of the reader that extended versions of some technical computations discussed briefly in this paper and the follow up paper [48] can be found in the preprint [47].



FIGURE 4. **Left:** *We do observations in the set U, marked by the blue boundary. This set contains the set U, defined in (11), that is a union of time-like geodesics. In the figure, the four light-like geodesics $\gamma_{x_j,\xi_j}([0,\infty))$, $j = 1, 2, 3, 4$ starting at the blue points $x_j \in U$ intersect at q before the first cut points of $\gamma_{x_j,\xi_j}([t_0,\infty))$, denoted by black points. The points $\gamma_{x_j,\xi_j}(t_0)$ are also shown as black points. We use interaction of waves to produce an artificial point source at q.* **Right:** *The future light cone $\mathcal{L}_g^+(q)$ emanating from the point q is shown as a red cone. The set of the light observation points $\mathcal{P}_U(q)$, see Definition 1.1, is the intersection of the set $\mathcal{L}_g^+(q)$ and the set U. The geodesic $\mu = \mu_{z,\eta}$ is marked by a black curve. This geodesic intersects the future light cone $\mathcal{L}_g^+(q)$ at a point x. The black vectors are the frame (Z_j) that is obtained using parallel translation along the geodesic μ. Near the intersection point x we detect singularities in normal coordinates centered at x and associated to the frame (Z_j).*

1.3. Remarks and applications

Remark 1.1. The technique developed in the proof of Theorem 1.5 can be applied to many non-linear equations, including many semi-linear equations where the metric g depends on the solution. For example, in the follow up paper [48], we will show how the inverse problem for the coupled Einstein equations and scalar field equations can be solved the using methods considered in this paper.

The techniques considered in this paper can be used also to study inverse problems for non-linear hyperbolic systems encountered in applications and in problems encountered in mathematical physics. For instance, in medical imaging, in the the recently developed ultrasound elastography imaging technique the elastic material parameters are reconstructed by sending (s-polarized) elastic waves that are imaged using (p-polarized) elastic waves, see e.g. [35, 55]. This imaging method uses interaction of waves and is based on the non-linearity of the system.

Remark 1.2. Theorem 1.5 can in some cases be improved so that also the conformal factor of the metric tensor can be reconstructed. Indeed, Theorem 1.5 and Corollary 1.3 imply that if $W \subset I(p^-, p^+)$ is Vacuum, i.e., Ricci-flat, and all points $x \in W$ can be connected by a curve $\alpha \subset W^{int}$ to points of V, then under the assumptions of Theorem 1.5, the whole metric tensor g in W can be reconstructed.

Remark 1.3. Theorem 1.5 deals with an inverse problem for "near field" measurements. We remark that for inverse problems for linear equations the measurements of the Dirichlet-to-Neumann map or the "near field" measurements are equivalent to scattering or "far field" information. Analogous considerations for non-linear equations have not yet been done but are plausible. On related inverse scattering problems, see [25, 57].

Remark 1.4. Also, one can ask if one can make an approximate image of the space-time doing only one measurement. In general, in many inverse problems several measurements can be packed together to one measurement. For instance, for the wave equation with a time-independent simple metric this is done in [34]. Similarly, Theorem 1.5 and its proof makes possible to do approximate reconstructions in a suitable class of manifolds with only one measurement, see Remark 5.1. Physically speaking, this means doing a measurement with only one source, done by carefully engineered sequence of sudden sources in V that send several spherical waves and interact at the unknown part of the spacetime. The details of this construction are outside the scope of this paper and will be presented elsewhere.

2. Earliest observation time functions

2.1. **Preliminary constructions.** Let (M, g) be a globally hyperbolic Lorentzian manifold of type $(1, n-1)$. In addition to the Lorentzian metric g, we introduce on M a smooth complete Riemannian metric g^+, see [62], which makes it possible to introduce a Riemannian distance on M and a Sasaki distance on TM.

For $W \subset M$, let $L^+W = \bigcup_{p\in W} L^+_pM \subset TM$ be the bundle of future pointing light-like vectors and $L^{*,+}W = \bigcup_{p\in W} L^{*,+}_pM \subset TM$ be the bundle of future pointing light-like co-vectors. The projection from the tangent bundle TM to the base point of a vector is denoted by $\pi : TM \to M$.

Let us consider points $x, y \in M$. For $x < y$, we define the time separation function $\tau(x, y) \in [0, \infty)$ to be the supremum of the lengths $L(\alpha) = \int_0^1 \sqrt{-g(\dot\alpha(s), \dot\alpha(s))}\, ds$ of the piecewise smooth causal paths $\alpha : [0, 1] \to M$ from x to y. If the condition $x < y$ does not hold, we define $\tau(x, y) = 0$. We note that $\tau(x, y)$ satisfies the reverse triangle inequality

$$\tau(x, y) + \tau(y, z) \le \tau(x, z), \quad \text{for } x \le y \le z. \tag{9}$$

As M is globally hyperbolic, the time separation function $(x, y) \mapsto \tau(x, y)$ is continuous in $M \times M$ by [63, Lem. 14.21]. By [63, Lem. 14.22], the sets $J^\pm(q)$ are closed. For $q < p$ there is a causal geodesic $\gamma([0, 1])$ with $\gamma(0) = q$ and $\gamma(1) = p$ such that $L(\gamma) = \tau(q, p)$, see [63, Lem. 14.19]. This geodesic, called a longest path from q to p, may not be unique.

When (x, ξ) is a non-zero vector, we define $\mathcal{T}(x, \xi) \in (0, \infty]$ to be the maximal value for which $\gamma_{x,\xi} : [0, \mathcal{T}(x, \xi)) \to M$ is defined.

In addition to points $p^\pm = \widehat\mu(s_\pm)$, we use the points $p_{\pm 2} = \widehat\mu(s_{\pm 2})$ where $-1 < s_{-2} < s_-$ and $s_+ < s_{+2} < 1$.

For $(x, \xi) \in L^+M$, we define the cut locus function

$$\rho(x, \xi) = \sup\{s \in [0, \mathcal{T}(x, \xi));\ \tau(x, \gamma_{x,\xi}(s)) = 0\}, \tag{10}$$

c.f. [5, Def. 9.32]. The points $x_1 = \gamma_{x,\xi}(t_1)$ and $x_2 = \gamma_{x,\xi}(t_2)$, $t_1, t_2 \in [0, t_0]$, $t_1 < t_2$, are cut points on $\gamma_{x,\xi}([0, t_0])$ if $t_2 - t_1 = \rho(x_1, \xi_1)$ where $\xi_1 = \dot\gamma_{x,\xi}(t_1)$. In particular, the point $p(x, \xi) = \gamma_{x,\xi}(s)|_{s=\rho(x,\xi)}$, if it exists, is called the first cut point on the geodesic $\gamma_{x,\xi}([0, \mathcal{T}(x, \xi))$. Using [5, Thm. 9.33], we see that the function $\rho(x, \xi)$ is lower semi-continuous on a globally hyperbolic Lorentzian manifold (M, g).

Recall that $\gamma_{x,\xi}(t)$ is a conjugate point on $\gamma_{x,\xi}([0, \mathcal{T}(x, \xi))$ if the differential of the map $\exp_x$ is not invertible at $t\xi$. By [5, Th. 9.15], on a globally hyperbolic manifold, $p(x, \xi)$ is either the first conjugate point along $\gamma_{x,\xi}$, or the first point on $\gamma_{x,\xi}$ where there is another light-like geodesic $\gamma_{x,\eta}$ from x to $p(x, \xi)$, $\eta \neq c\xi$.

Let us return to the longest paths. If $q < p$ but $\tau(q, p) = 0$, then there is a light-like geodesic $\gamma_{q,\xi}([0, t])$ from q to p so that there are no

cut points on $\gamma_{q,\xi}([0,t))$, see [63, Thm. 10.51 and Prop. 14.19]. Note that if $\gamma_{q,\xi}([0,t])$ is a light-like geodesic from q to $p=\gamma_{q,\xi}(t)$ such that there are cut-points on the geodesic $\gamma_{q,\xi}([0,t))$, (9) and (10) yield $\tau(q,p)>0$.

We say that a curve $\alpha([t_1,t_2])$ is a pre-geodesic if $\alpha(t)$ is a C^1-smooth curve such that $\dot\alpha(t)\neq 0$ on $t\in[t_1,t_2]$, and $\alpha([t_1,t_2])$ can be re-parametrized so that it becomes a geodesic. A conformal diffeomorphism preserves the light-like pre-geodesics by [5, Th. 9.17].

Moreover, it follows from [63, Prop. 10.46] that if q can be connected to p with a causal path which is not a light-like pre-geodesic then $\tau(q,p)>0$. Let us apply this fact to a path from q to p which is the union of the future pointing light-like pre-geodesics $\gamma_{q,\eta}([0,t_0])\subset M$ and $\gamma_{x_1,\theta}([0,t_1])\subset M$, where $x_1=\gamma_{q,\eta}(t_0)$, $p=\gamma_{x_1,\theta}(t_1)$ and $t_0,t_1>0$. Let $\xi=\dot\gamma_{q,\eta}(t_0)$. Then, if there is no $c>0$ such that $\xi=c\theta$, or equivalently, the union of these geodesic is not a light-like pre-geodesics, we have $\tau(q,p)>0$. In particular, this implies that there exists a time-like geodesic from q to p. In the following we call this kind of argument for a union of light-like geodesics a short-cut argument.

2.1.1. *Smaller observation domain U.* Next we define a domain $U\subset V$ that is a union of time-like paths.

We assume that we given a family of future pointing, C^∞-smooth, time-like paths $\mu_a:[-1,1]\to V$, indexed by $a\in\overline{\mathcal{A}}$, where A is a connected metric space and the completion of $\mathcal{A}$, denoted by $\overline{\mathcal{A}}$, is compact. We assume that there is $\widehat a\in\mathcal{A}$ such that $\widehat\mu=\mu_{\widehat a}$. Also, we assume that $(a,s)\mapsto\mu_a(s)$ defines a continuous map $\overline{A}\times[-1,1]\to M$ and an open map $\mathcal{A}\times[-1,1]\to M$. Then, we define the smaller observation domain $U\subset V$ to be the set

$$U=\bigcup_{a\in\mathcal{A}}\mu_a([-1,1]). \tag{11}$$

Note that as $(a,s)\mapsto\mu_a(s)$ in is a continuous and open map $A\times[-1,1]\to M$, the set U is open.

Let us give an example how the family μ_a of time-like paths and the index set $\mathcal{A}$ can be constructed when we are given the set V, as a differentiable manifold, and the conformal type of the metric $g|_V$. Then, we could choose a smooth metric $\widetilde g$ in V that is conformal to $g|_V$ and use an open neighborhood $\mathcal{U}_{\widehat z,\widehat\eta}$ of $(\widehat z,\widehat\eta)$ in TM as the index set $\mathcal{A}$. Here, $\widehat z=\widehat\mu(-1)$ and $\widehat\eta=\partial_s\widehat\mu(-1)$ and for $(z,\eta)\in\mathcal{U}_{\widehat z,\widehat\eta}$ the path $\mu_{z,\eta}$ is defined to be a geodesic (i.e., a freely falling observer) $\mu_{z,\eta}:[-1,1]\to M$ with respect to the metric $\widetilde g$, such that $\mu_{z,\eta}(-1)=z$, and $\partial_s\mu_{z,\eta}(s)|_{s=-1}=\eta$. When $\mathcal{U}_{\widehat z,\widehat\eta}$ is a sufficiently small neighborhood of $(\widehat z,\widehat\eta)$ in TM, the set U given by (11) is a relatively open subset of V. Note that then $\widehat\mu=\mu_{\widehat z,\widehat\eta}$.

Let $s_{-2}\in(-1,s_-)$, and $s_{+2}\in(s_+,1)$. By replacing $\mathcal{A}$ in the formula (11) by a smaller neighborhood of $\widehat a$ we may assume for all $a\in\overline{\mathcal{A}}$ we

have

$$\mu_a(s_{-2}) \in I^+(\mu_{\widehat{a}}(-1)) \cap I^-(p^-),\ \mu_a(s_{+2}) \in I^-(\mu_{\widehat{a}}(1)) \cap I^+(p^+). \tag{12}$$

When V is given as differentiable manifold and the conformal class of g is given, we may define a family of smooth time-like paths $\mu_a : [-1,1] \to V$, $a \in \overline{\mathcal{A}}$ having the above properties and define the neighborhood U given in (12). d

By [63, Prop. 5.7], any point $x \in M$ has a neighborhood W_x that is convex, i.e., for all $x_1, x_2 \in W_x$ any causal geodesic in M connecting x_1 and x_2 is a subset of W_x. The compact set $\widehat{\mu}([s_-, s_+])$ can be covered with a finite union of such neighborhoods. Thus when the pair $(U, g|_U)$ is given, we see using the fact that $\widehat{\mu}$ is time-like and the continuity of the time-separation function $\tau(x,y)$ that one can determine all points $(x.y) \in W_0 \times W_0$ satisfying $x \ll y$ when W_0 is some sufficiently small open neighborhood of $\widehat{\mu}$. Thus by making the set $\mathcal{A}$ a smaller neighborhood of $\widehat{a}$ we may assume that the set U defined in (11) is contained in the set W_0. Hence without loss of generality we may assume that the set

$$R_U = \{(x,y) \in U \times U;\ x \ll y\} \tag{13}$$

is known. Note that here the relation $\ll$ is defined on the whole manifold M. Thus we in particular know the set $U' = U \cap (I^+(p^-) \cap I^-(p^+))$.

2.1.2. *Observation time functions.* Instead of the light observation sets we can consider the earliest observation time functions that we proceed to define.

Definition 2.1. *Let $a \in \overline{\mathcal{A}}$. For $x \in M$ we define $f_a^+(x), f_a^-(x) \in [-1,1]$ by setting*

$$\begin{aligned} f_a^+(x) &= \inf(\{s \in (-1,1);\ \tau(x, \mu_a(s)) > 0\} \cup \{1\}), \\ f_a^-(x) &= \sup(\{s \in (-1,1);\ \tau(\mu_a(s), x) > 0\} \cup \{-1\}). \end{aligned}$$

We call $f_a^+(x)$ the earliest observation time from the point q on the path μ_a. The functions $f_a^+ : M \to \mathbb{R}$, $a \in \overline{\mathcal{A}}$ are called the earliest observation time function on the path μ_a.

We will show that the map

$$\mathcal{F} : J^-(p^+) \setminus I^-(p^-) \to C(\overline{\mathcal{A}}), \quad \mathcal{F}(q) : a \mapsto f_a^+(q),$$

that maps a point q to the earliest observation times corresponding to the point, is a continuous function.

Proposition 2.2. *Let (M,g) be an open, C^∞-smooth, globally hyperbolic Lorentzian manifold of dimension $n \geq 3$. Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a metric space which completion $\overline{\mathcal{A}}$ is compact, and $\mu_a : [-1,1] \to M$, $a \in \overline{\mathcal{A}}$ be C^∞-smooth, time-like paths. Let $p^- = \mu_{\widehat{a}}(s_-)$ and $p^+ = \mu_{\widehat{a}}(s_)$ with $\widehat{a} \in \mathcal{A}$ and $-1 < s_- < s_+ < 1$. Also, assume that $(a,s) \mapsto \mu_a(s)$ defines a continuous map $\overline{A} \times [-1,1] \to M$ and an open map $\mathcal{A} \times [-1,1] \to M$.*

Let $W \subset M$ be open set such that $\overline{W} \subset J^-(p^+) \setminus I^-(p^-)$ is compact. Then $\mathcal{F} : W \to \mathcal{F}(W)$ is a homeomorphism.

Remark 2.1 The above imbedding $q \mapsto \mathcal{F}(q)$ is similar to the Kuratowski embedding used in the study of metric spaces. The Kuratowski embedding is the isometric map $K : x \mapsto \mathrm{dist}(x, \cdot\,)$ from the metric space (N, dist) to the space $C(N)$. Also, in several inverse problems for Riemannian manifolds with boundary, a homeomorphic image of the compact manifold N has been obtained by using the embedding $R : x \mapsto \mathrm{dist}(x, \cdot\,)$, $R : N \to C(\partial N)$, see [2, 45, 51].

The point of the remark is to note that in several geometric inverse problems, in order to reconstruct an unknown manifold W from a given data, one needs to construct a copy of the manifold. The importance of Proposition 2.2 lies in the fact that it can be used to construct a homeomorphic image of the original Lorentzian manifold W embedded in the known space $C(\overline{\mathcal{A}})$. After the homeomorphic image $\mathcal{F}(W)$ of the manifold is constructed, we can construct other structures on it, e.g., the differentiable coordinates and a metric tensor conformal to the original metric.

We need the following simple properties of the functions $f_a^{\pm}(x)$.

Lemma 2.3. *Let $a \in \overline{\mathcal{A}}$ and $q \in J^-(p^+) \setminus I^-(p^-)$. Then*

(i) We have that $s_{-2} \le f_a^+(q) \le s_{+2}$.

(ii) We have $\mu_a(f_a^+(q)) \in J^+(q)$ and $\tau(q, \mu_a(f_a^+(q))) = 0$. Moreover, the function $s \mapsto \tau(q, \mu_a(s))$ is continuous, non-decreasing on the interval $s \in [-1, 1]$, and it is strictly increasing on $[f_a^+(q), 1]$.

(iii) Assume that $p \in U$. Then $p = \mu_a(f_a^+(q))$ with some $a \in \mathcal{A}$ if and only if $p \in \mathcal{P}_U(q)$ and $\tau(q, p) = 0$. Furthermore, these are equivalent to the fact that there are $\xi \in L_q^+ M$ and $t \in [0, \rho(q, \xi)]$ such that $p = \gamma_{q,\xi}(t)$.

(iv) The function $\mathbf{F} : (a, q) \mapsto f_a^+(q)$ is continuous on $\overline{\mathcal{A}} \times (J^-(p^+) \setminus I^-(p^-))$.

For $q \in J^+(p^-) \setminus I^+(p^+)$ the claims analogous to (i), (iii), and (iv) are valid for $q \mapsto f_a^-(q)$.

Proof. (i) This property follows from (12).

(ii) Since $J^+(q)$ is closed, $\mu_a(f_a^+(q)) \in J^+(q)$. The continuity of $s \mapsto \tau(q, \mu_a(s))$ follows from the continuity of $\tau(x, y)$ on $M \times M$.

If $\tau(q, \mu_a(f_a^+(q)))$ would be strictly positive, we would have $\mu_a(f_a^+(q)) \in I^+(q)$ and there would exist $s < f_a^+(q)$ such that $\mu_a(s) \in I^+(q)$. As this is not possible, we have $\tau(q, \mu_a(f_a^+(q))) = 0$.

Consider $s < s'$. Since μ_a is a time like-path, $\tau(\mu_a(s), \mu_a(s')) > 0$. Thus, when $s' > s \ge f_a^+(q)$, the inequality (9) yields $\tau(q, \mu_a(s)) < \tau(q, \mu_a(s'))$. For $s < f_a^+(q)$ we have $\mu_a(s) \notin J^+(q)$ and $\tau(q, \mu_a(s)) = 0$.

(iii) It is sufficient to prove the claim when $p \neq q$. First, assume that $p = \mu_a(f_a^+(q))$. Then $p \in J^+(q)$ and by (ii), we have $\tau(q,p) = 0$. The existence of the light-like geodesic follows from the above.

Second, assume that $p \in J^+(q)$ and $\tau(q,p) = 0$. This implies by [63, Prop. 14.19] that there exists a light-like geodesic $\gamma_{q,\xi}([0,t])$ from q to p. If $\gamma_{q,\xi}([0,t))$ would have a cut-point, then $\tau(q,p) > 0$ which is not possible. Thus, $t \in [0, \rho(q,\xi)]$.

Third, assume that $p = \gamma_{q,\xi}(t)$ with $\xi \in L_q^+M$ and $0 \leq t \leq \rho(q,\xi)$. Then $\tau(q,p) = 0$. Let $a \in \mathcal{A}$ and $s_0 \in [-1,1]$ be such that $p = \mu_a(s_0)$. As $q \notin I(p^-)$, using (12) we see that $q \notin I^-(\mu_a(s_{-2}))$ and hence $s_0 \geq s_{-2} > -1$. By (i), $\tau(q, \mu_a(s)) > 0$ for $s > f_a^+(q)$ and thus $s_0 \leq f_a^+(q) \leq s_{-2}$. However, $q \leq p = \mu_a(s_0)$ and $\tau(q, \mu_a(s)) > 0$ for $s \in (s_0, 1)$. Thus $s_0 \geq f_a^+(q)$. Hence, $s_0 = f_a^+(q)$ and $p = \mu_a(f_a^+(q))$.

(v) Assume that $x_j \to x$ in $J^-(p^+) \setminus I^-(p^-)$ and $a_j \to a$ as $j \to \infty$. Let $s_j = f_{a_j}^+(x_j)$ and $s = f_a^+(x)$.

Since τ is continuous, for any $\varepsilon > 0$ we have $\lim_{j\to\infty} \tau(x_j, \mu_{a_j}(s + \varepsilon)) = \tau(x, \mu_a(s+\varepsilon)) > 0$. Then for j large enough $\mu_{a_j}(s+\varepsilon) \in I^+(x_j)$, so that $s_j \leq s + \varepsilon$. As $\varepsilon > 0$ is arbitrary, $\limsup_{j\to\infty} s_j \leq s$ Thus $\mathbf{F}$ is upper-semicontinuous.

Next, suppose $\liminf_{j\to\infty} s_j = \widetilde{s} < s$ and denote $\varepsilon = \tau(\mu_a(\widetilde{s}), \mu_a(s)) > 0$. Then by choosing a subsequence, we may assume that $\lim_{j\to\infty} s_j = \widetilde{s} < s$. By continuity of τ and (9),

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{j\to\infty} \tau(x_j, \mu_{a_j}(s)) &\geq \liminf_{j\to\infty} \tau(x_j, \mu_{a_j}(s_j)) + \tau(\mu_{a_j}(s_j), \mu_{a_j}(s)) \\ &\geq 0 + \tau(\mu_a(\widetilde{s}), \mu_a(s)) = \varepsilon, \end{aligned}$$

and we obtain $\tau(x, \mu_a(s)) = \lim_{j\to\infty} \tau(x_j, \mu_{a_j}(s)) \geq \varepsilon$. This is not possible as $s = f_a^+(x)$. Hence $\liminf_{j\to\infty} s_j \geq s$ and $\mathbf{F}$ is also lower-semicontinuous. This proves (iv).

The analogous results for function f_a^- follow similarly by reversing the causality. □

Next we consider the earliest light observation sets in the observation domains U and V. We will show that without loss of generality we can take the neighhborhood V of $\widehat{\mu}$ to be the set U defined in (11).

Lemma 2.4. *Let $q \in J^-(p^+) \setminus I^-(p^-)$.*

(i) The earliest light observation set of q in U has the form

$$\mathcal{E}_U(q) = \{\mu_a(f_a^+(q));\ a \in \mathcal{A}\}. \tag{14}$$

(ii) The earliest light observation set of q in U satisfies

$$\mathcal{E}_U(q) = \{x \in \mathcal{P}_U(q);\ \text{there are no } y \in {}^+(q) \text{ such that } y \ll x\}. \tag{15}$$

Observe that in (15) the chronology relation $\ll$ is defined in M.

(iii) The earliest light observation sets in the observation domains in U and V satisfy

$$\mathcal{E}_U(q) = \mathcal{E}_V(q) \cap U.$$

Proof. (i) Let $x \in \mathcal{E}_U(q) \subset U$. Then by Lemma 2.3 (i) there is $a \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $x = \mu_a(s)$ with $s \in [s_{-2}, s_{+2}]$ and $x \in \mathcal{P}_U(q)$.

Assume that $\tau(q,x) > 0$. Then $s > f_a^+(q)$. By Lemma 2.3 (iii), $y = \mu_a(f_a^+(q)) \in \mathcal{P}_U(q)$ and the time-like path $\mu_a([f_a^+(q), s]) \subset U$ connects $y \in \mathcal{P}_U(q)$ to x. This is not possible by the definition of $\mathcal{E}_U(q)$. This shows that $\tau(q,x) = 0$. As $x \in \mathcal{P}_U(q)$, by Lemma 2.3 (iii) we have $x \in \{\mu_a(f_a^+(q));\ a \in \mathcal{A}\}$.

On the other hand, assume that $x = \mu_a(f_a^+(q))$ with $a \in \mathcal{A}$. Then by Lemma 2.3 (iii), $x \in \mathcal{P}_U(q)$ and $\tau(q,x) = 0$. Then, if there would exist $y \in \mathcal{P}_U(q)$ that is connected to x with a future pointing time-like path, we would have $\tau(y,x) > 0$. Thus (9) implies that $\tau(q,x) \geq \tau(q,y) + \tau(y,x) > 0$. This shows that no such y can exist and $x \in \mathcal{E}_U(q)$. These prove (i).

(ii) Let $x \in \mathcal{P}_U(q)$ and $a \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $x \in \mu_a$.

If there is $y \in {}^+(q)$ such that $y \ll x$, then by (9) we have $\tau(q,x) > 0$. On other hand, if $\tau(q,x) > 0$, then $y = \mu_a(f_a^+(q))$ satisfies by $y \in {}^+(q)$ and $y \ll x$. For $x \in \mathcal{P}_U(q)$ Lemma 2.3 (ii)-(iii) yields that $x \in \mathcal{E}_U(q)$ if and only if $\tau(q,x) = 0$. Hence (ii) follows.

(iii) The claim (ii) and definition of $\mathcal{E}_V(q)$ implies that $\mathcal{E}_U(q) \subset \mathcal{E}_V(q) \cap U$. On the other hand, assume that $x \in \mathcal{E}_V(q) \cap U$. Let $a \in \mathcal{A}$ and $s \in [-1,1]$ such that $x = \mu_a(s)$. As we saw above, $f_a^+(q) \geq s_{-2}$. If $\tau(q,x) > 0$, then $s > f_a^+(q)$ and the time-like path $\mu_a([f_a^+(q), s]) \subset U \subset V$ connects $\mu_a(f_a^+(q)) \in \mathcal{P}_V(q)$ to x. This is not possible by the definition of $\mathcal{E}_V(q)$, and thus $\tau(q,x) = 0$. By Lemma 2.3 (ii)-(iii), this yields $x \in \mathcal{E}_U(q)$. These show (iii). □

Due to the above lemma, without loss of generality we may in Theorem 1.2 make the neighborhood V of the path $\widehat{\mu}$ smaller and consider the case when the set V is replaced by U. We will do so for the remaining of this paper.

2.2. **Observation time representation of a Lorentzian manifold.**

In this section our main goal is to prove Proposition 2.2.

2.2.1. *The direction set.*

Definition 2.5. *Let $q \in J^-(p^+) \setminus I^-(p^-)$. Let*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}_U(q) = \{(y,\eta) \in L^+U \ \ ; \ \ & y = \gamma_{q,\xi}(t) \in U,\ \eta = \dot\gamma_{q,\xi}(t), \\ & \text{with some } \xi \in L_q^+M,\ 0 \leq t \leq \rho(x,\xi)\}, \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}_U^{reg}(q) = \{(y,\eta) \in L^+U \ \ ; \ \ & y = \gamma_{q,\xi}(t) \in U,\ \eta = \dot\gamma_{q,\xi}(t), \\ & \text{with some } \xi \in L_q^+M,\ 0 < t < \rho(x,\xi)\}. \end{aligned}$$

We say that $\mathcal{C}_U(q)$ is the direction set of q and $\mathcal{C}_U^{reg}(q)$ is the regular direction set of q.

Then, $\mathcal{E}_U(q) = \pi(\mathcal{C}_U(q))$. We denote $\mathcal{E}_U^{reg}(q) = \pi(\mathcal{C}_U^{reg}(q))$ where $\pi : TU \to U$ is the canonical projection, $\pi(y,\eta) = y$. We say that $\mathcal{E}_U^{reg}(q)$ is the regular earliest light observation set of q.

Note that $\mathcal{E}_U(q) = \{\mathcal{E}_a(q);\ a \in \mathcal{A}\}$ and that the lower semicontinuity of $\rho(x,\xi)$ implies that $\mathcal{E}_U^{reg}(q) \subset U$ and $\mathcal{C}_U^{reg}(q) \subset TU$ are smooth $(n-1)$ and n dimensional submanifolds, respectively.

We need the following auxiliary result:

Lemma 2.6. (i) *Let $y \in U$, $\eta \in L_y^+M$, $r_1 > 0$, and $q \in W$ be such that $q \notin \gamma_{y,\eta}([-r_1,0])$ and $\gamma_{y,\eta}([-r_1,0]) \subset U$. Then $(y,\eta) \in \mathcal{C}_U(q)$ if and only if $\gamma_{y,\eta}([-r_1,0]) \subset \mathcal{E}_U(q)$.*

(ii) *Let $y \in U$, $\eta \in L_y^+M$, and $\widehat{t} > 0$ be the largest number such that the geodesic $\gamma_{y,\eta}((-\widehat{t},0])$ is defined and has no cut points. Then for $q \in W$ we have $q \in \gamma_{y,\eta}((-\widehat{t},0))$ if and only if $(y,\eta) \in \mathcal{C}_U^{reg}(q)$.*

Proof. (i) Suppose $(y,\eta) \in \mathcal{C}_U(q)$. Then $y \in \mathcal{E}_U(q)$ and $\tau(q,y) = 0$. Since $q \notin \gamma_{y,\eta}([-r_1,0]) \subset U$, there is $t > r_1$ such that $\gamma_{y,\eta}(-t) = q$ and for $\xi = \dot\gamma_{y,\eta}(-t)$ we have $\gamma_{y,\eta}([-r_1,0]) = \gamma_{q,\xi}([t-r_1,t]) \subset \mathcal{P}_U(q)$. If there would be $y_1 \in \gamma_{y,\eta}([-r_1,0])$ such that $y_1 \notin \mathcal{E}_U(q)$, it follows from (15) that there is $z \in \mathcal{P}_U(q)$ such that $z \ll y_1$. Then $q \le z \ll y_1 \le y$. These imply that $\tau(q,y) > 0$ and $y \in \mathcal{E}_U(q)$ which is not possible by Lemma 2.3 (iii) and Lemma 2.4. This shows that $\gamma_{y,\eta}([-r_1,0]) \subset \mathcal{E}_U(q)$.

On the other hand, assume that $\gamma_{y,\eta}([-r_1,0]) \subset \mathcal{E}_U(q)$. Then Lemma 2.3(ii) implies that $\tau(q,y) = 0$. Denote $y_1 = \gamma_{y,\eta}(-r_1)$. Since $y_1 \in \mathcal{E}_U(q)$ and $y_1 \neq q$, there is $\xi \in L_q^+M$ and $t_1 > 0$ such that $\gamma_{q,\xi}(t_1) = y_1$. Then the union of the geodesics $\gamma_{q,\xi}([0,t_1])$ and $\gamma_{y,\eta}([-r_1,0])$ form a causal path from q to y. Using short cut arguments, we see that if the union of these geodesics do not form one light-like pre-geodesic, we have $\tau(q,y) > 0$, that is not possible. Hence $\gamma_{y,\eta}([-r_1,0])$ lies in the continuation of $\gamma_{q,\xi}([0,t_1])$, that is, there is $t > 0$ such that $\gamma_{y,\eta}([-r_1,0]) \subset \gamma_{q,\xi}([0,t])$ and $y = \gamma_{q,\xi}(t)$. Then, there is $c > 0$ such that $\eta = c\dot\gamma_{q,\xi}(t)$. Moreover, if $\gamma_{q,\xi}([0,t))$ would contain cut points then [63, Prop. 10.46] implies that $\tau(q,y) > 0$. This would lead to a contradiction with $y \in \mathcal{E}_U(q)$. Hence, $\gamma_{q,\xi}([0,t))$ contains no cut points. Therefore, we have shown that $t \le \rho(q,\xi)$, $y = \gamma_{q,\xi}(t)$, and $\eta = c\dot\gamma_{q,\xi}(t)$. These imply that $(y,\eta) \in \mathcal{C}_U(q)$.

(ii) Let $(y,\eta) \in L^+U$ and $\widehat{t} > 0$ be as in the claim and $q \in W$.

First, assume that $q \in \gamma_{y,\eta}(-t_1)$, $t_1 \in (0,\widehat{t})$. Then, due to the symmetry of the cut points, $\tau(q,y) = 0$ and thus for $\xi = \dot\gamma_{y,\eta}(-t_1)$ we have $y = \gamma_{q,\xi}(t_1)$ and $t_1 < \rho(q,\xi)$. Thus $(y,\eta) \in \mathcal{C}_U^{reg}(q)$.

Second, assume that $(y,\eta) \in \mathcal{C}_U^{reg}(q)$. Again, we see that there is $t_1 > 0$ such that $q = \gamma_{y,\eta}(-t_1)$ and for $\xi = \dot\gamma_{y,\eta}(-t_1)$ we have $y = \gamma_{q,\xi}(t_1)$ and $t_1 < R_1 := \rho(q,\xi)$. Since ρ is a lower semi-continuous, we have that

when $\varepsilon \in (0, (R_1 - t_1)/2)$ is small enough, the point $x_1 = \gamma_{q,\xi}(-\varepsilon)$ and $\xi_1 = \dot\gamma_{q,\xi}(-\varepsilon)$ satisfy $\rho(x_1, \xi_1) > R_1 - \varepsilon > t_1 + \varepsilon$ and hence $\tau(x_1, y) = 0$. This yields that $\widehat{t} > t_1$. Thus $q \in \gamma_{y,\eta}((-\widehat{t}, 0))$. □

Using this result we determine the direction sets $\mathcal{C}_U(q)$ from $\mathcal{E}_U(W)$:

Lemma 2.7. *Assume that we are given the data (91). Then*

(i) *For any $y \in U$, we can identify from the set $\mathcal{E}_U(W)$ the element $\mathcal{E}_U(q)$ for which $q = y$, if it exists. For such elements $L^+_y M \subset \mathcal{C}_U(q)$.*

(ii) *Let $q \in W$ and $(y, \eta) \in L^+U$. Then $(y, \eta) \in \mathcal{C}^{reg}_U(q)$ if and only if there exists a light-like pre-geodesic $\alpha([t_1, t_2]) \subset U$ such that $y = \alpha(t)$, $\eta = \dot\alpha(t)$, $t_1 < t < t_2$, and $\alpha([t_1, t_2]) \subset \mathcal{E}_U(q)$.*

(iii) *When $\mathcal{E}_U(q) \in \mathcal{E}_U(W)$ is given, one can determine the sets $\mathcal{C}_U(q)$, $\mathcal{C}^{reg}_U(q)$, and $\mathcal{E}^{reg}_U(q)$.*

Proof. (i) We observe that $q = y$ if and only if for $y \in \mathcal{E}_U(q)$ there are no $\eta \in L^+_y M$ and $t_0 > 0$ such that $\gamma_{y,\eta}([-t_0, 0]) \subset \mathcal{E}_U(q)$. Claim (i) follows from this observation.

(ii) Let $q \in W$ and $\xi \in L^+_q W$ and $(y, \eta) = (\gamma_{q,\xi}(1), \dot\gamma_{q,\xi}(1))$. Using Definition 2.5 we see that $(y, \eta) \in \mathcal{C}^{reg}_U(q)$ if and only if $\gamma_{q,\xi}(1) \in U$ and $\rho(q, \xi) > 1$. This is equivalent to the fact that there are $t_1 \in (0, 1)$ and $t_2 > 1$ such that $\gamma_{q,\xi}([t_1, t_2]) \subset U$ and $(\gamma_{q,\xi}(t_2), \dot\gamma_{q,\xi}(t_2)) \in \mathcal{C}_U(q)$. Also, by Lemma 2.6 (i) this is equivalent to the fact that there are $t_1 \in (0, 1)$ and $t_2 > 1$ such that $\gamma_{q,\xi}([t_1, t_2]) \subset \mathcal{E}_U(q)$. This proves (ii).

(iii) Let $\mathcal{E}_U(q)$ be given. Since the conformal class of $g|_U$ is given, we can identify all light-like pre-geodesics in U. Thus by using (ii), we can verify for any $(y, \eta) \in L^+U$ whether it holds that $(y, \eta) \in \mathcal{C}^{reg}_U(q)$ or not. Thus we can determine the set $\mathcal{C}^{reg}_U(q)$. Then the set $\mathcal{C}_U(q)$ can be determined as the closure of the set $\mathcal{C}^{reg}_U(q)$ in TU. Finally, the set $\mathcal{E}^{reg}_U(q) = \pi(\mathcal{C}^{reg}_U(q))$ can be constructed using the map $\pi : TU \to U$.□

2.2.2. *Construction of W as a topological manifold.* For $q \in J^-(p^+) \setminus I^-(p^-)$ we define the continuous function $F_q : \overline{\mathcal{A}} \to \mathbb{R}$ by $F_q(a) = f^+_a(q)$. Also, we denote by $\mathcal{F} : J^-(p^+) \setminus I^-(p^-) \to C(\overline{\mathcal{A}})$ the function $\mathcal{F}(q) = F_q$, that maps q to the function $F_q : \mathcal{A} \to \mathbb{R}$.

By Def. 1.1, the set $\mathcal{E}_U(q)$ determines the restriction of $F_q = \mathcal{F}(q)$ in $\mathcal{A}$ via the formula

$$F_q(a) = s, \text{ where } s \in [-1, 1] \text{ is such that } \mu_a(s) \in \mathcal{E}_U(q),\ a \in \mathcal{A}. \tag{17}$$

As $F_q : \overline{\mathcal{A}} \to \mathbb{R}$ is continuous, this determines $F_q(a)$ for all $a \in \overline{\mathcal{A}}$. Also, $F_q = \mathcal{F}(q)$ determines $\mathcal{E}_U(q)$ via the formula

$$\mathcal{E}_U(q) = \{\mu_a(F_q(a));\ a \in \mathcal{A}\}. \tag{18}$$

Recall that W is open and relatively compact and $\overline{W} \subset J^-(p^+) \setminus I^-(p^-)$. Below, we consider the sets $\mathcal{F}(W) = \{\mathcal{F}(q);\ q \in W\} \subset C(\overline{\mathcal{A}})$ and $\mathcal{E}_U(W) = \{\mathcal{E}_U(q);\ q \in W\} \subset 2^U$ as two representations for W. We will construct the topological and differentiable structure of W using

$\mathcal{F}(W)$ and the conformal class of the metric $g|_W$ using $\mathcal{E}_U(W)$. First, we consider the reconstruction of the topological type of W.

Now we are ready to prove Proposition 2.2.

Proof (of Prop. 2.2). Below, let $\overline{W} = \mathrm{cl}\,(W)$ be the closure of W in M, such that $\overline{W} \subset J^-(p^+) \setminus I^-(p^-)$. As $\overline{\mathcal{A}} \times \overline{W}$ is compact and thus $\mathbf{F} : \mathcal{A} \times \overline{W} \to \mathbb{R}$ is uniformly continuous by Lemma 2.3 (iv), the map $\mathcal{F} : \overline{W} \to C(\overline{\mathcal{A}})$ is continuous. Next we show that the map $\mathcal{F} : \overline{W} \to \mathcal{F}(\overline{W})$ is injective. Since $\mathcal{F}(q)$ determines the set $\mathcal{E}_U(q)$ uniquely by (18), it is enough to show that the map $\mathcal{E}_U : \overline{W} \to \mathcal{E}_U(\overline{W})$ is injective. To prove this, we assume the opposite: Assume that there are $q_1 \neq q_2$ that satisfy $\mathcal{E}_U(q_1) = \mathcal{E}_U(q_2)$. By Lemma 2.7 (iii), this implies

$$\mathcal{C}_U(q_1) = \mathcal{C}_U(q_2). \tag{19}$$

Choose $a \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $q_i \notin \mu_a$, $i \in \{1, 2\}$. Let $(p, \eta) \in \mathcal{C}_U(q_i)$ with $p = \mu_a(f_a^+(q_i))$. Then there are $t_i > 0$ such that $q_i = \gamma_{p,\eta}(-t_i)$. Since $q_1 \neq q_2$, we have $t_1 \neq t_2$, and let us assume that $t_2 > t_1$. Then, we see there are $\xi_i \in L^+_{q_i}(M)$ such that

$$(p, \eta) = (\gamma_{q_i,\xi_i}(t_i),\, \dot\gamma_{q_i,\xi_i}(t_i)), \quad (q_1, \xi_1) = (\gamma_{q_2,\xi_2}(t_2 - t_1),\, \dot\gamma_{q_2,\xi_2}(t_2 - t_1)).$$

Since $\rho(q, \xi)$ is lower semicontinuous, for any $\delta_1 > 0$ there is $\delta_2 > 0$ such that $\rho(q_2, \xi_2') > \rho(q_2, \xi_2) - \delta_1$ when $\xi_2' \in T_qM$ satisfies $\|\xi_2' - \xi_2\|_{g^+} < \delta_2$. Choosing δ_1 and δ_2 to be sufficiently small, we have that there is $\xi_2' \in T_{q_2}M$ that is not parallel to ξ_2, $\|\xi_2' - \xi_2\| < \delta_2$, and $t_2' \in (t_2 - 2\delta_1, t_2 - \delta_1)$ such that $p' = \gamma_{q_2,\xi_2'}(t_2') \in U$, $p' \neq q_1$, and $t_2' < \rho(q_2, \xi_2')$. Thus for $\eta' = \dot\gamma_{q_2,\xi_2'}(t_2')$ we have $(p', \eta') \in \mathcal{C}_U(q_2)$. By (19), $(p', \eta') \in \mathcal{C}_U(q_1)$, and hence there is $t_1' > 0$ such that $q_1 = \gamma_{p',\eta'}(-t_1')$.

Observe that $\xi_1' = \dot\gamma_{p',\eta'}(-t_1')$ and ξ_1 are not parallel. We have that the union of the geodesic $\gamma_{q_2,\xi_2}([0, t_2 - t_1])$ and the geodesic $\gamma_{p',\eta'}([0, -t_1'])$, oriented in the opposite direction, form a causal curve from q_2 to p' that is not a light-like pre-geodesic, and hence $\tau(q_2, p') > 0$. This is not possible as $p' \in \mathcal{E}_U(q_2)$. This contradiction proves that $\mathcal{E}_U : \overline{W} \to \mathcal{E}_U(\overline{W})$ is injective.

Since $C(\overline{\mathcal{A}})$ is a Hausdorff space, $\overline{W}$ is a compact set, and the map $\mathcal{F} : \overline{W} \to \mathcal{F}(\overline{W})$ is continuous and injective, we have that $\mathcal{F} : \overline{W} \to \mathcal{F}(\overline{W})$ is a homeomorphism. Thus $\mathcal{F} : W \to \mathcal{F}(W)$ is a homeomorphism. □

Remark 2.2. We note that for a dense sequence $\{q_j\}_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}$ in W the collection of light observations $\{\mathcal{E}_U(q_j)\}_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+}$ determines the collection $\{\mathcal{F}(q_j)\}_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+} \subset C(\overline{\mathcal{A}})$. These points are dense in $\mathcal{F}(\overline{W})$. Thus the closure of this collection in $C(\overline{\mathcal{A}})$ determines the whole set $\mathcal{F}(\overline{W})$, or equivalently, the set $\mathcal{E}_U(\overline{W})$.

2.2.3. *Estimates for the location of the first cut point.* We finish this section by auxiliary results that are needed in the proof of Theorem 1.5.

Below, we use for a pair $(x,\xi)\in L^+M$ the notation

$$(x(t),\xi(t))=(\gamma_{x,\xi}(t),\dot\gamma_{x,\xi}(t)),\quad t\in\mathbb{R}_+. \tag{20}$$



FIGURE 5. **Left:** *The figure shows the situation in Lemma 2.8. The point $\widehat{x}=\widehat{\mu}(r_1)$ is on the time-like geodesic $\widehat{\mu}$ shown as a black line. The black diamond is the set $J^+(p^-)\cap J^-(p^+)$, (x,ξ) is a light-like direction close to $(\widehat{x},\widehat{\xi})$, and $x_1=\gamma_{x,\xi}(t_0)=x(t_0)$. The points $q_0=\gamma_{x,\xi}(\rho(x,\xi))$ and $q_1=\gamma_{x(t_0),\xi(t_0)}(\rho(x(t_0),\xi(t_0)))$ are the first cut point on $\gamma_{x,\xi}$ corresponding to the points x and x_1, respectively. The blue and black points on $\gamma_{\widehat{x},\widehat{\zeta}}$ are the corresponding cut points on $\gamma_{\widehat{x},\widehat{\zeta}}$. Also, $z=\widehat{\mu}(r_1)$, $r_1=f_{\widehat{a}}^-(p_1)$.* **Right:** *The figure shows the configuration in formulas (44) and (45). We send light-like geodesics $\gamma_{x_j,\xi_j}([t_0,\infty))$ from x_j, $j=1,2,3,4$. The boundary $\partial\mathcal{N}((\vec{x},\vec{\xi}),t_0)$ is denoted by red line segments. We assume the these geodesics intersect at the point q before their first cut points p_j.*

Later, we will consider waves sent from a point $x\in U$ that propagate near a geodesic $\gamma_{x,\xi}([0,\infty))$. These waves may have singularities near the conjugate points of the geodesic and due to this we analyze next how the conjugate points move along a geodesic when its initial point is moved from x to $\gamma_{x,\xi}(t_0)$.

Lemma 2.8. *There are $\vartheta_1,\kappa_1,\kappa_2>0$ such that for all $\widehat{x}=\widehat{\mu}(r_0)$ with $r_0\in[s_-,s_+]$, $\widehat{\xi}\in L^+_{\widehat{x}}M$, $\|\widehat{\xi}\|_{g^+}=1$, $t_0\in[\kappa_1,4\kappa_1]$, and $(x,\xi)\in L^+M$ satisfying $d_{g^+}((\widehat{x},\widehat{\xi}),(x,\xi))\le\vartheta_1$ the following holds:*

(ii) If $0<t\le 5\kappa_1$, then $f_{\widehat{a}}^-(\gamma_{\widehat{x},\widehat{\xi}}(t))=r_0$,

(ii) If $0<t\le 5\kappa_1$, then $\gamma_{x,\xi}(t)\in U$,

(iii) Assume that t_1 satisfies $t_0+\rho(\gamma_{x,\xi}(t_0),\dot\gamma_{x,\xi}(t_0))\le t_1<\mathcal{T}(x,\xi)$ and $p_1=\gamma_{x,\xi}(t_1)\in J^-(\widehat{\mu}(1))$. Then $r_1=f_{\widehat{a}}^-(p_1)$ satisfies $r_1-r_0>2\kappa_2$.

Note that above in (iii) we can choose $t_1=t_0+\rho(\gamma_{x,\xi}(t_0),\dot\gamma_{x,\xi}(t_0))$ in which case p_1 is the first cut point q_1 of $\gamma_{x,\xi}([t_0,\infty))$, see Fig. 5(Left).

Proof. Let $B = \{(\widehat{x},\widehat{\xi}) \in L^+M;\ \widehat{x} \in \widehat{\mu}([s_-,s_+]),\ \|\widehat{\xi}\|_{g^+} = 1\}$. Since B is compact, the positive and lower semi-continuous function $\rho(x,\xi)$ obtains its minimum on B. This proves the claim (i) when $\kappa_1 \in (0, \frac{1}{5}\inf\{\rho(\widehat{x},\widehat{\xi});\ (\widehat{x},\widehat{\xi}) \in B\})$.

(ii) For $\vartheta > 0$ small enough, $K_\vartheta = \{(x,\xi) \in L^+M;\ d_{g^+}((x,\xi),B) \leq \vartheta\}$ is a compact subset of L^+U. Thus yields easily (ii) when ϑ_1 is small enough.

(iii) Let $T_+(x,\xi) = \sup\{t \geq 0\ ;\ \gamma_{x,\xi}(t) \in J^-(\widehat{\mu}(1))\}$, $\vartheta \in (0,\vartheta_1)$ be so small that $K_\vartheta \subset L^+U$, and

$$K_\vartheta^0 = \{(x,\xi) \in K_\vartheta;\ \rho(x(\kappa_1),\xi(\kappa_1)) + \kappa_1 \leq T_+(x,\xi)\},\quad K_\vartheta^1 = K_\vartheta \setminus K_\vartheta^0.$$

Using [63, Lem. 14.13], we see that $T_+(x,\xi)$ is bounded in K_ϑ. Note that for $t_0 \geq \kappa_1$ and $a > t_0$ the geodesic $\gamma_{x,\xi}([t_0,a])$ can have a cut point only if $\gamma_{x,\xi}([\kappa_1,a])$ has a cut point and thus $t_0 + \rho(x(t_0),\xi(t_0)) \geq \kappa_1 + \rho(x(\kappa_1),\xi(\kappa_1))$. If $K_\vartheta^0 = \emptyset$, the claim is valid as the condition $p_1 \in J^-(\widehat{\mu}(1))$ does not hold for any $(x,\xi) \in K_\vartheta^1$. Thus it is enough to consider the case when $K_\vartheta^0 \neq \emptyset$.

Let

$$G_\vartheta = \{(x,\xi,t) \in K_\vartheta \times \mathbb{R}_+;\ \rho(x(\kappa_1),\xi(\kappa_1)) + \kappa_1 \leq t \leq T_+(x,\xi)\}.$$

As $\rho(x,\xi)$ is lower semi-continuous and $T_+(x,\xi)$ is upper semi-continuous and bounded, the sets K_ϑ^0 and G_ϑ are compact.

For $(x,\xi,t) \in G_\vartheta$, the geodesic $\gamma_{x,\xi}([\kappa_1,t])$ has a cut point. Thus for $y = \gamma_{x,\xi}(t)$, we have $\tau(x,y) > 0$. Hence, for $z = \widehat{\mu}(f_{\widehat{a}}^-(x))$, we have $\tau(z,y) \geq \tau(z,x) + \tau(x,y) \geq \tau(x,y) > 0$. This shows that $f_{\widehat{a}}^-(y) - f_{\widehat{a}}^-(x) > 0$. Since G_ϑ is compact and $f_{\widehat{a}}^-$ is continuous, $\varepsilon_1 := \inf\{f_{\widehat{a}}^-(\gamma_{x,\xi}(t)) - f_{\widehat{a}}^-(x);\ (x,\xi,t) \in G_\vartheta\} > 0$.

Then, if $\rho(x(\kappa_1),\xi(\kappa_1)) + \kappa_1 \leq t_1 < \mathcal{T}_+(x,\xi)$ and $p_1 = \gamma_{x,\xi}(t_1)$, we have that $r_1 = f_{\widehat{a}}^-(p_1)$ and $r_2 = f_{\widehat{a}}^-(x)$ satisfy $r_1 - r_2 \geq \varepsilon_1$.

As $f_{\widehat{a}}^-$ is continuous and $\widehat{\mu}([-1,1])$ is compact, we see that by making ϑ_1 smaller if necessary, we can assume that if $\widehat{x} = \widehat{\mu}(r_0) \in \widehat{\mu}$ and $d_{g^+}(x,\widehat{x}) \leq \vartheta_1$ then $|f_{\widehat{a}}^-(x) - f_{\widehat{a}}^-(\widehat{x})| < \varepsilon_1/2$. Let $\kappa_2 = \varepsilon_1/4$. Then $r_1 - r_2 \geq \varepsilon_1$ and $r_2 - r_0 = |f_{\widehat{a}}^-(x) - f_{\widehat{a}}^-(\widehat{x})| < \varepsilon_1/2$ imply that $r_1 - r_0 > \varepsilon_1/2 = 2\kappa_2$. This proves the claim.

□

Note that for proving the uniqueness of the inverse problem we need to consider two manifolds, (M_1,g_1) and (M_2,g_2) with the same data. For these manifolds, we can choose ϑ_1, κ_1, and κ_2 so that they are the same for both manifolds.

Finally, consider the case when (M_1,g_1) and (M_2,g_2) are two manifolds satisfying (4) with the sets W_1 and W_2 and a time-orientation preserving conformal diffeomorphism $\Phi : U_1 \to U_2$. Then, if U_1 is defined using paths $\mu_a^{(1)}(s)$, $a \in \overline{\mathcal{A}}$, $s \in [-1,1]$, by making $\mathcal{A}$ a smaller neighborhood of $\widehat{a}$ if necessary, we can use on U_2 the paths $\mu_a^{(2)}(s) = \Phi(\mu_a^{(1)}(s))$,

$a \in \overline{\mathcal{A}}$. With such paths the sets $\mathcal{F}(W_1) \subset C(\overline{\mathcal{A}})$ on manifold M_1 and $\mathcal{F}(W_2) \subset C(\overline{\mathcal{A}})$ on manifold M_2 coincide.

3. Inverse problem for active measurements

In this section we start the proof of Theorem 1.5. We recall that without loss of generality we may replace the set V where we do measurements by a smaller set U of the form (11). Moreover, as the proof is constructive, and to simplify the notations, we do the constructions on just one Lorentzian manifold, (M, g) and assume that we are given the data

(21) the differentiable manifold U, the time-like paths $\mu_a : [-1, 1] \to U$, $a \in \mathcal{A}$, and the source-to-field map L_U.

Here, $L_U : f \mapsto u|_U$ is the source-to-observation map defined in (8) when the set $U \subset V$ is used as the observation set.

3.1. Asymptotic expansion for the non-linear wave equation.

Let us consider the non-linear wave equation

$$\begin{aligned} &\Box_g u + au^2 = f, \quad \text{in } M_0 = (-\infty, t_0) \times N, \\ &u|_{(-\infty,0)\times N} = 0, \end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

where $a = a(x)$ is a smooth, nowhere vanishing function, $M_0 \subset M = \mathbb{R} \times N$, where (M, g) is a globally hyperbolic Lorentzian manifold. Below, let $Q = Q_g = \Box_g^{-1}$ be the causal inverse operator of $\Box_g$.

When $B \subset N$ is compact and f in $C_0([0, t_0]; H_0^6(B)) \cap C_0^1([0, t_0]; H_0^5(B))$ is small enough, we see by using [68, Prop. 9.17], [36, Thm. III], or [12, App. III] that the equation (22) has a unique solution $u \in C([0, t_0]; H^5(N)) \cap C^1([0, t_0]; H^4(N))$. For a detailed analysis, see Appendix B in [47].

Let us consider the case when $f = \varepsilon f_1$ where $\varepsilon > 0$ is small. Then, we can write

$$u = \varepsilon w_1 + \varepsilon^2 w_2 + \varepsilon^3 w_3 + \varepsilon^4 w_4 + E_\varepsilon$$

where w_j and the reminder term E_ε satisfy (see e.g. [12, App. III])

$$\begin{aligned} w_1 &= Qf_1, \\ w_2 &= -Q(a\, w_1\, w_1), \\ w_3 &= 2Q(a\, w_1\, Q(a\, w_1\, w_1)), \\ w_4 &= -Q(a\, Q(a\, w_1\, w_1)\, Q(a\, w_1\, w_1)) \\ &\quad -4Q(a\, w_1\, Q(a\, w_1\, Q(a\, w_1\, w_1))), \\ &\|E_\varepsilon\|_{C([0,t_0];H_0^4(N))\cap C^1([0,t_0];H_0^3(N))} \le C\varepsilon^5. \end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

In particular, we will consider sources f_1 for which the linearized term w_1 is a distorted plane wave.

Remark 3.1. The set U, given as differentiable manifold, and the source-to-wave map L_U determine the linearized source-to-wave map $L_U^{lin} : f \mapsto \partial_\varepsilon(L_U(\varepsilon f))|_{\varepsilon=0}$. Furthermore, this map determines all pairs (f, w_1) such that $L_U^{lin}(f) = w_1$ and both f and w_1 are compactly supported in U. Observer that then $(\Box_g+2a)w_1 = f$. In particular, for any $(x_0, \eta_0) \in T^*U$ there a pair (f^τ, w_1^τ) such that that $w_1^\tau(x) = e^{i\tau\phi(x)}\psi(x)$, where $\tau > 0$, $\phi, \psi \in C_0^\infty(U)$, $d\phi(x_0) = \eta_0$, in some neighborhood of x_0 we have $\psi = 1$, and $(\Box_g + 2a)w_1^\tau = f^\tau$. Then

$$g(\eta_0, \eta_0) = \lim_{\tau\to\infty} \frac{-(\Box_g + 2a)w_1^\tau(x_0)}{\tau^2} = \lim_{\tau\to\infty} \frac{-f^\tau(x_0)}{\tau^2}$$

This shows that U and L_U determine the metric tensor $g|_U$ in U. Observe that by the same arguments, V and L_V determine the metric tensor $g|_V$ in V, too.

3.2. **Linear wave equation and distorted plane waves.**

3.2.1. *Lagrangian distributions.* Let us recall definition of the conormal and Lagrangian distributions that we will use below, see [28, 37, 58]. Let X be a manifold of dimension n and $\Lambda \subset T^*X\setminus\{0\}$ be a Lagrangian submanifold. Let $\phi(x, \theta)$, $(x, \theta) \in X \times \mathbb{R}^N$ be a non-degenerate phase function that locally parametrizes Λ, i.e., in a conic neighborhood $\Gamma \subset T^*X \setminus \{0\}$ the submanifold Λ coincides with the set $\{(x, d_x\phi(x, \theta)) \in \Gamma;\ d_\theta\phi(x, \theta) = 0\}$. We say that a distribution $u \in \mathcal{D}'(X)$ is a Lagrangian distribution associated with Λ and denote $u \in \mathcal{I}^m(X; \Lambda)$, if in local coordinates u can be represented as an oscillatory integral,

$$u(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} e^{i\phi(x,\theta)}a(x, \theta)\, d\theta, \tag{24}$$

where $a(x, \theta) \in S^\mu(X; \mathbb{R}^N)$ is a classical symbol of order $\mu = m+n/4-N/2$, see [28, 37, 58]. A function $c(x, \theta)$ that is μ-positive homogeneous in θ, i.e., $c(x, s\theta) = s^\mu c(x, \theta)$ for $s > 0$, is the principal symbol of u if there is $\phi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$ that is 1 near zero such that $a(x, \theta) - (1 - \phi(\theta))c(x, \theta) \in S^{\mu-1}(X; \mathbb{R}^N)$.

In particular, when $S \subset X$ is a submanifold, its conormal bundle $N^*S = \{(x, \xi) \in T^*X \setminus \{0\};\ x \in S,\ \xi \perp T_xS\}$ is a Lagrangian submanifold. If u is a Lagrangian distribution associated to Λ_1 where $\Lambda_1 = N^*S$, we say that u is a conormal distribution.

Let us next consider the case when $X = \mathbb{R}^n$ and let $(x^1, x^2, \dots, x^n) = (x', x'', x''')$ be the Euclidean coordinates with $x' = (x_1, \dots, x_{d_1})$, $x'' = (x_{d_1+1}, \dots, x_{d_1+d_2})$, $x''' = (x_{d_1+d_2+1}, \dots, x_n)$. If $S_1 = \{x' = 0\} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, $\Lambda_1 = N^*S_1$ then $u \in \mathcal{I}^m(X; \Lambda_1)$ can be represented by (24) with $N = d_1$ and $\phi(x, \theta) = x'\cdot\theta$. For example, $\delta_{S_1}(x) \in \mathcal{I}^{-n/4+d_1/2}(\mathbb{R}^n; N^*S_1)$.

Next we recall the definition of $\mathcal{I}^{p,l}(X; \Lambda_1, \Lambda_2)$, the space of the distributions u in $\mathcal{D}'(X)$ associated to two cleanly intersecting Lagrangian manifolds $\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2 \subset T^*X \setminus \{0\}$, see [15, 28, 58]. These classes have been

widely used in the study of inverse problems, see [13, 22]. Let us start with the case when $X = \mathbb{R}^n$.

These distributions we defined in [33] and generalized the construction in [58] of parametrices for operators of real-principal type. These include parametrices of the wave operator $P = \partial_t^2 - \Delta_G$ in $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n$ with a Riemannian metric G on $\mathbb{R}^n$.

Consider the solution of $(\partial_t^2 - \Delta_G)u = \delta_0$ with source at 0. The delta-distribution δ_0 has singularities (wave front set) on the conormal bundle of $\{0\}$, that is $\Lambda_0 = \{(0, \xi);\ \xi \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \setminus 0\}$. The characteristic variety of $\partial_t^2 - \Delta_G$, that is, $\Lambda_P = \{(t, x, \tau, \xi) \in T^*\mathbb{R}^{n+1};\ p(t, x, \tau, \xi) = 0\}$, where $p(t, x, \tau, \xi) = \tau^2 - G_{jk}(x)\xi^j\xi^k$, with τ and ξ being the dual variables of t and x, repectively. When this characteristic variety intersects the Lagrangian manifold Λ_0, new singularities develop on the forward or the backward flow out from $\Lambda_P \cap \Lambda_0$ by the characteristic curves which are the integral curves of the Hamiltonian vector field of P. This generates a new Lagrangian manifold Λ_1 and the solution satisfies $u \in \mathcal{I}^{p,l}(\Lambda_0, \Lambda_1)$ with suitable indexes p and l. In [58, 33] a symbol calculus is developed for this kind of distributions (25). Further developments for the theory of the paired Lagrangian distributions are in [29].

Let $S_1, S_2 \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be the linear subspaces of codimensions d_1 and $d_1 + d_2$, respectively, $S_2 \subset S_1$, given by $S_1 = \{x' = 0\}$, $S_2 = \{x' = x'' = 0\}$. Let us denote $\Lambda_1 = N^*S_1$, $\Lambda_2 = N^*S_2$. Then $u \in \mathcal{I}^{p,l}(\mathbb{R}^n; N^*S_1, N^*S_2)$ if and only if

$$u(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d_1+d_2}} e^{i(x'\cdot\theta' + x''\cdot\theta'')} a(x, \theta', \theta'')\, d\theta' d\theta'', \tag{25}$$

where the symbol $a(x, \theta', \theta'')$ belongs in the product type symbol class $S^{\mu_1,\mu_2}(\mathbb{R}^n; (\mathbb{R}^{d_1} \setminus 0) \times \mathbb{R}^{d_2})$ that is the space of function $a \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^{d_1} \times \mathbb{R}^{d_2})$ that satisfy

$$|\partial_x^\gamma \partial_{\theta'}^\alpha \partial_{\theta''}^\beta a(x, \theta', \theta'')| \le C_{\alpha\beta\gamma K}(1 + |\theta'| + |\theta''|)^{\mu_1 - |\alpha|}(1 + |\theta''|)^{\mu_2 - |\beta|} \tag{26}$$

for all $x \in K$, multi-indexes α, β, γ, and compact sets $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$. Above, $\mu_1 = p + l - d_1/2 + n/4$ and $\mu_2 = -l - d_2/2$.

When X is a manifold of dimension n and $\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2 \subset T^*X \setminus \{0\}$ are two cleanly intersecting Lagrangian manifolds, we define the class $\mathcal{I}^{p,l}(X; \Lambda_1, \Lambda_2) \subset \mathcal{D}'(X)$ to consist of locally finite sums of distributions of the form $u = Au_0$, where $u_0 \in \mathcal{I}^{p,l}(\mathbb{R}^n; N^*S_1, N^*S_2)$ and $S_1, S_2 \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ are the linear subspace of codimensions d_1 and $d_1 + d_2$, respectively, such that $S_2 \subset S_1$, and A is a Fourier integral operator of order zero with a canonical relation Σ for which $\Sigma \circ (N^*S_1)' \subset \Lambda_1'$ and $\Sigma \circ (N^*S_2)' \subset \Lambda_2'$. Here, for $\Lambda \subset T^*X$ we denote $\Lambda' = \{(x, -\xi) \in T^*X;\ (x, \xi) \in \Lambda\}$. When X and Y are manifolds and $\Sigma \subset T^*X \times T^*Y$ we use also the notation $\Sigma' = \{(x, \xi, y, -\eta);\ (x, \xi, y, \eta) \in \Sigma\}$.

In most cases, below $X = M$. We denote then $\mathcal{I}^p(M; \Lambda_1) = \mathcal{I}^p(\Lambda_1)$ and $\mathcal{I}^{p,l}(M; \Lambda_1, \Lambda_2) = \mathcal{I}^{p,l}(\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2)$. Also, $\mathcal{I}(\Lambda_1) = \cup_{p\in\mathbb{R}} \mathcal{I}^p(\Lambda_1)$.

By [28, 58], microlocally away from Λ_1 and Λ_0,

$$\mathcal{I}^{p,l}(\Lambda_0,\Lambda_1)\subset\mathcal{I}^{p+l}(\Lambda_0\setminus\Lambda_1)\quad\text{and}\quad\mathcal{I}^{p,l}(\Lambda_0,\Lambda_1)\subset\mathcal{I}^{p}(\Lambda_1\setminus\Lambda_0),\tag{27}$$

respectively. Thus the principal symbol of $u\in\mathcal{I}^{p,l}(\Lambda_0,\Lambda_1)$ is well defined on $\Lambda_0\backslash\Lambda_1$ and $\Lambda_1\backslash\Lambda_0$. We denote $\mathcal{I}(\Lambda_0,\Lambda_1)=\cup_{p,l\in\mathbb{R}}\mathcal{I}^{p,l}(\Lambda_0,\Lambda_1)$.

Below, when $\Lambda_j=N^*S_j$, $j=1,2$ are conormal bundles of smooth cleanly intersecting submanifolds $S_j\subset M$ of codimension m_j, where $\dim(M)=n$, we use the traditional notations,

$$\mathcal{I}^{\mu}(S_1)=\mathcal{I}^{\mu+m_1/2-n/4}(N^*S_1),\quad\mathcal{I}^{\mu_1,\mu_2}(S_1,S_2)=\mathcal{I}^{p,l}(N^*S_1,N^*S_2),\tag{28}$$

where $p=\mu_1+\mu_2+m_1/2-n/4$ and $l=-\mu_2-m_2/2$, and call such distributions the conormal distributions associated to S_1 or product type conormal distributions associated to S_1 and S_2, respectively. By [28], $\mathcal{I}^{\mu}(X;S_1)\subset L^p_{loc}(X)$ for $\mu<-m_1(p-1)/p$, $1\leq p<\infty$.

For the wave operator $\Box_g$ on the globally hyperbolic manifold (M,g), $\mathrm{Char}\,(\Box_g)$ is the set of light-like co-vectors with respect to g. For $(x,\xi)\in\mathrm{Char}\,(\Box_g)$, $\Theta_{x,\xi}$ denotes the bicharacteristic of $\Box_g$. Then, $(y,\eta)\in\Theta_{x,\xi}$ if and only if there is $t\in\mathbb{R}$ such that for $a=\eta^\sharp$ and $b=\xi^\sharp$ we have $(y,a)=(\gamma^g_{x,b}(t),\dot\gamma^g_{x,b}(t))$ where $\gamma^g_{x,b}$ is a light-like geodesic with respect to the metric g with the initial data $(x,b)\in LM$. Here, we use notations $(\xi^\sharp)^j=g^{jk}\xi_k$ and $(b^\sharp)_j=g_{jk}b^k$.

Let $P=\Box_g+B^0+B^j\partial_j$, where B^0 is a scalar function and $B^j\partial_j$ is a vector field. Then P is a classical pseudodifferential operator of real principal type and order $m=2$ on M. By [58], see also [50], P has a parametrix $Q\in\mathcal{I}^{p,l}(\Delta'_{T^*M},\Lambda_P)$, $p=\frac{1}{2}-m$, $l=-\frac{1}{2}$. Here, we identify the operator Q with its Schwartz kernel $Q(x,y)$, $\Delta_{T^*M}=N^*(\{(x,x);\ x\in M\})$, and $\Lambda_g\subset T^*M\times T^*M$ is the Lagrangian manifold associated to the canonical relation of the operator P, that is,

$$\Lambda_g=\{(x,\xi,y,-\eta);\ (x,\xi)\in\mathrm{Char}\,(P),\ (y,\eta)\in\Theta_{x,\xi}\},\tag{29}$$

where $\Theta_{x,\xi}\subset T^*M$ is the bicharacteristic of P containing (x,ξ). When (M,g) is a globally hyperbolic manifold, the operator P has a causal inverse operator, see e.g. [4, Thm. 3.2.11]. We denote it by P^{-1} and by [58], we have $P^{-1}\in\mathcal{I}^{-3/2,-1/2}(\Delta'_{T^*M},\Lambda_g)$. We will repeatedly use the fact (see [28, Prop. 2.1]) that if $F\in\mathcal{I}^p(\Lambda_0)$ and Λ_0 intersects $\mathrm{Char}(P)$ transversally so that all bicharacterestics of P intersect Λ_0 only finitely many times, then $(\Box_g+B^0+B^j\partial_j)^{-1}F\in\mathcal{I}^{p-3/2,-1/2}(\Lambda_0,\Lambda_1)$ where $\Lambda'_1=\Lambda_g\circ\Lambda'_0$ is called the flowout from $\Lambda_0\cap\mathrm{Char}(P)$ by the integral curves of the Hamiltonian vector field H_P associated to the Lorentzian metric, that is,

$$\Lambda_1=\{(x,-\xi);\ (x,\xi,y,-\eta)\in\Lambda_g,\ (y,\eta)\in\Lambda_0\}.\tag{30}$$

3.2.2. *Distorted plane waves satisfying a linear wave equation.* Next we consider a distorted plane wave whose singular support is concentrated near a geodesic. These waves, sketched in Fig. 1(Right), propagate near the geodesic $\gamma_{x_0,\zeta_0}([t_0,\infty))$ and are singular on a surface $K(x_0,\zeta_0;t_0,s_0)$, defined below in (31). The surface $K(x_0,\zeta_0;t_0,s_0)$ is a subset of the light cone ${}^+(x')$, $x'=\gamma_{x_0,\xi_0}(t_0)$ and the parameter s_0 gives a "width" of the singular support of the wave around $\gamma_{x_0,\xi_0}([2t_0,\infty))$. When $s_0\to 0$, its singular support tends to the set $\gamma_{x_0,\zeta_0}([2t_0,\infty))$. Next we will define these waves.

We define the 3-submanifold $K(x_0,\zeta_0;t_0,s_0)\subset M_0$ associated to $(x_0,\zeta_0)\in L^+M_0$, $x_0\in U$ and parameters $t_0,s_0\in\mathbb{R}_+$ as

$$K(x_0,\zeta_0;t_0,s_0)=\{\gamma_{x',\eta}(t)\in M_0;\ \eta\in\mathcal{W},\ t\in(0,\infty)\},\tag{31}$$

where $(x',\zeta')=(\gamma_{x_0,\zeta_0}(t_0),\dot\gamma_{x_0,\zeta_0}(t_0))$ and $\mathcal{W}\subset L^+_{x'}(M_0,g)$ is a neighborhood of ζ' consisting of vectors $\eta\in L^+_{x'}(M_0)$ satisfying $\|\eta-\zeta'\|_{g^+}<s_0$. Note that $K(x_0,\zeta_0;t_0,s_0)\subset{}^+(x')$ is a subset of the light cone starting at $x'=\gamma_{x_0,\xi_0}(t_0)$ and that it is singular at the point x'. Let $S=\{x\in M_0;\mathbf{t}(x)=\mathbf{t}(\gamma_{x_0,\zeta_0}(2t_0))\}$ be a Cauchy surface that intersects $\gamma_{x_0,\zeta_0}(\mathbb{R})$ transversally at the point $\gamma_{x_0,\zeta_0}(2t_0)$. When $t_0>0$ is small enough,

$$Y(x_0,\zeta_0;t_0,s_0)=S\cap K(x_0,\zeta_0;t_0,s_0)\tag{32}$$

is a smooth 2-dimensional space-like surface that is a subset of U.

Let $\Lambda(x_0,\zeta_0;t_0,s_0)$ be the Lagrangian manifold that is the flowout from $N^*Y(x_0,\zeta_0;t_0,s_0)\cap N^*K(x_0,\zeta_0;t_0,s_0)$ on $\mathrm{Char}(\Box_g)$ in the future direction, see (30). When $K^{reg}\subset K=K(x_0,\zeta_0;t_0,s_0)$ is the set of points x that have a neighborhood W such that $K\cap W$ is a smooth 3-dimensional submanifold, we have $N^*K^{reg}\subset\Lambda(x_0,\zeta_0;t_0,s_0)$.

Assume that $X:W\to\mathbb{R}^4$ are local coordinates in an open set $W\subset M_0$, such that $X(Y\cap W)\subset\{x\in\mathbb{R}^4;\ x^jb^1_j=0,\ x^jb^2_j=0\}$, where $b^1_j,b^2_j\in\mathbb{R}$. Then, if $f\in\mathcal{I}^\mu(Y)$ is a conormal distribution having the form (24) with a phase function $\phi(x,\theta)=(\theta_1b^1_j+\theta_2b^2_j)x^j$, $(\theta_1.\theta_2)\in\mathbb{R}^2$ and the (positive homogeneous) principal symbol $c(x,\theta)$, we we say that $\widetilde c(x,\eta)=c(x,\theta)$ is the value of the principal symbol of f at $(x,\eta)\in N^*Y$, $\eta=\theta_1b^1_j+\theta_2b^2_j$.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $n\le n_0=-17$ be an integer, $t_0,s_0>0$, $Y=Y(x_0,\zeta_0;t_0,s_0)$, $K=K(x_0,\zeta_0;t_0,s_0)$, $\Lambda_1=\Lambda(x_0,\zeta_0;t_0,s_0)$. Let $(y,\xi)\in N^*Y\cap\Lambda_1$ and $(x,\eta)\in T^*M$ be on the same bicharacteristics of $\Box_g$ as $(y,\xi)\in T^*M$ such that $y\ll x$. Observe that then $((y,\xi),(x,\eta))\in\Lambda'_g$.*

Assume that $f\in\mathcal{I}^{n+1}(Y)$ is a conormal distribution that is supported in a neighborhood $U\subset M_0$ of $\gamma_{x_0,\zeta_0}\cap Y=\{\gamma_{x_0,\zeta_0}(2t_0)\}$ and has a classical symbol. Assume that $\mathcal{W}\subset T^*M$ is a sufficiently small neighborhood of (y,ξ) and that the symbol of f vanishes outside $\mathcal{W}$.

Let us consider the restriction of $w_1=\Box_g^{-1}f$ in $M_0\setminus Y$. Then $w_1|_{M_0\setminus Y}\in\mathcal{I}^{n-1/2}(M_0\setminus Y;\Lambda_1)$. Moreover, let $\widetilde f(y,\xi)$ be the principal

symbol of f at (y,ξ) and $\widetilde{a}(x,\eta)$ be the principal symbol of w_1 at $(x,\eta)\in\Lambda_1$. Then $\widetilde{a}(x,\eta)=R(x,\eta,y,\xi)\widetilde{f}(y,\xi)$ where $R=R(x,\eta,y,\xi)\in\mathbb{C}$ is non-zero.

We call the solution w_1 a distorted plane wave associated to the submanifold $K(x_0,\zeta_0;t_0,s_0)$. Below, we denote $f\in\mathcal{I}^{n+1}_C(Y(x_0,\zeta_0;t_0,s_0))$ if $f\in\mathcal{I}^{n+1}(Y(x_0,\zeta_0;t_0,s_0))$ and the principal symbols of f satisfies the conditions in Lemma 3.1.

Proof. It follows from [58] that the causal inverse of the scalar wave operator $\Box_g$ satisfies $\Box_g^{-1}\in\mathcal{I}^{-3/2,-1/2}(\Delta'_{T^*M_0},\Lambda_g)$. Here, $\Delta_{T^*M_0}$ is the conormal bundle of the diagonal of $M_0\times M_0$ and Λ_g is the flow-out of the canonical relation of $\Box_g$. A geometric representation for its kernel is given in [50]. By [28, Prop. 2.1], this yields $w_1|_{M_0\setminus Y}\in\mathcal{I}^{n-1/2}(\Lambda_1)$ and the formula $\widetilde{a}(x,\eta)=R(x,\eta,y,\xi)\widetilde{f}(y,\xi)$ for the principal symbols. where R is obtained by solving an ordinary differential equation along a bicharacteristic curve. Making similar considerations for the adjoint of the $\Box_g^{-1}$, i.e., considering the propagation of singularities using reversed causality, we see that R is non-zero. □

3.3. **Microlocal analysis of the non-linear interaction of waves.** Next we consider the interaction of four C^k-smooth waves having conormal singularities, where $k\in\mathbb{Z}_+$ is sufficiently large. Interaction of such waves produces a "corner point" in the spacetime. For related microlocal tools that concern scattering by corners, see [78, 79]. Earlier considerations of interaction of three interacting waves has been done by Melrose and Ritter [59, 60] and Rauch and Reed, [66] for semilinear hyperbolic equations in two space dimensions. The appearance of the new wavefronts due to the interaction of non-linear terms at caustics or due to boundary diffraction have been analyzed in [42, 81]. Recently, the interaction of two strongly singular waves has been studied by Luc and Rodnianski [53]. We note that in these works concerning the interaction of singularities in direct problems one usually assumes that the geometrical setting of the interacting singularities is a priori known. In our case where, when we study waves on an unknown manifold, we do not know the geometry of caustics and the caustics can even be of an unstable type. Due to this, we consider in this section the interaction of waves when there are no caustics and use in Sec. 4 global Lorentzian geometry to obtain a procedure that marches through the diamond set $J(p^-,p^+)$ by reconstructing it in small pieces that goes around the problem of caustics.

3.3.1. *Forth order interaction of waves for the non-linear wave equation.* Next, we introduce a vector of four ε variables denoted by $\vec{\varepsilon}=(\varepsilon_1,\varepsilon_2,\varepsilon_3,\varepsilon_4)\in\mathbb{R}^4$. Let $s_0,t_0>0$. For the non-linear wave equation we denote by $u_{\vec{\varepsilon}}$ the solution of the non-linear wave equation (7) with

source $f_{\vec\varepsilon}$ given by

$$f_{\vec\varepsilon} := \sum_{j=1}^{4} \varepsilon_j f_j, \quad f_j \in \mathcal{I}_C^{n+1}(Y(x_j,\zeta_j;t_0,s_0)), \tag{33}$$

and (x_j,ζ_j) are light-like vectors with $x_j \in U$. Moreover, we assume that for some $r_2>0$ and $s_- + r_2 < s' < s_+$ the sources satisfy

$$\operatorname{supp}(f_j) \cap J^+(\operatorname{supp}(f_k)) = \emptyset, \quad \text{for all } j \neq k, \tag{34}$$

$$J^+(W_0) \cap J^-(W_0) \subset I(\widehat\mu(s'-r_2), \widehat\mu(s')) \subset U, \quad W_0 := \bigcup_{j=1}^{4} \operatorname{supp}(f_j).$$

The first condition implies that the supports of the sources are causally independent.

The sources f_j give raise to the solutions of the linearized wave equations, which we denote by

$$u_j := w_1^{(j)} = \partial_{\varepsilon_j} u_{\vec\varepsilon}|_{\vec\varepsilon=0} = Q(f_j) \in \mathcal{I}(\Lambda(x_j,\zeta_j;t_0,s_0)),$$

where $Q = \Box_g^{-1}$. In the following we use the notations $\partial^1_{\vec\varepsilon} u_{\vec\varepsilon}|_{\vec\varepsilon=0} := \partial_{\varepsilon_1} u_{\vec\varepsilon}|_{\vec\varepsilon=0}$, $\partial^2_{\vec\varepsilon} u_{\vec\varepsilon}|_{\vec\varepsilon=0} := \partial_{\varepsilon_1}\partial_{\varepsilon_2} u_{\vec\varepsilon}|_{\vec\varepsilon=0}$, $\partial^3_{\vec\varepsilon} u_{\vec\varepsilon}|_{\vec\varepsilon=0} := \partial_{\varepsilon_1}\partial_{\varepsilon_2}\partial_{\varepsilon_3} u_{\vec\varepsilon}|_{\vec\varepsilon=0}$, and

$$\partial^4_{\vec\varepsilon} u_{\vec\varepsilon}|_{\vec\varepsilon=0} := \partial_{\varepsilon_1}\partial_{\varepsilon_2}\partial_{\varepsilon_3}\partial_{\varepsilon_4} u_{\vec\varepsilon}|_{\vec\varepsilon=0}.$$

Below, for the non-linear wave equation, we denote the wave produced by the fourth order interaction of waves u_j by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{U}^{(4)} &= \partial^4_{\vec\varepsilon} u_{\vec\varepsilon}|_{\vec\varepsilon=0} = Q\mathcal{S}^{(4)}, \\ \mathcal{S}^{(4)} &= -\sum_{\sigma\in\Sigma(4)} \Big(a\, Q(a\, u_{\sigma(4)}\, u_{\sigma(3)})\, Q(a\, u_{\sigma(2)}\, u_{\sigma(1)}) \\ &\qquad + 4a\, u_{\sigma(4)}\, Q(a\, u_{\sigma(3)}\, Q(a\, u_{\sigma(2)}\, u_{\sigma(1)}))\Big), \end{aligned} \tag{35}$$

where $\Sigma(4)$ is the set of permutations σ of the set $\{1,2,3,4\}$, see (23).

3.3.2. *On the singular support of the non-linear interaction of three waves.* Let us next consider four light-like future pointing directions (x_j,ξ_j), $j=1,2,3,4$, and use below the notations, see (20),

$$(\vec x,\vec\xi) = ((x_j,\xi_j))_{j=1}^4, \quad (\vec x(t),\vec\xi(t)) = ((x_j(t),\xi_j(t)))_{j=1}^4, \quad t>0.$$

We will consider the case when we send distorted plane waves propagating on surfaces $K_j = K(x_j,\xi_j;t_0,s_0)$, $t_0,s_0>0$, cf. (31), and these waves interact.

Next we consider the geometry related to the 3-interactions of the waves. Let $\mathcal{X}((\vec x,\vec\xi);t_0,s_0) \subset L^+M_0$ be set of all future directed light-like vectors $(x,\xi) \in L^+M_0$ that are in the normal bundles $N^*(K_{j_1} \cap K_{j_2} \cap K_{j_3})$ with some $1 \le j_1 < j_2 < j_3 \le 4$.

Moreover, we define $\mathcal{Y}((\vec{x},\vec{\xi});t_0,s_0)$ to be the set of all $y\in M_0$ such that there are $(z,\zeta)\in\mathcal{X}((\vec{x},\vec{\xi});t_0,s_0)$, and $t\geq 0$ such that $\gamma_{z,\zeta}(t)=y$. Finally, let

$$\mathcal{Y}((\vec{x},\vec{\xi});t_0)=\bigcap_{s_0>0}\mathcal{Y}((\vec{x},\vec{\xi});t_0,s_0)\subset M. \tag{36}$$

The three wave interaction happens then on $\pi(\mathcal{X}((\vec{x},\vec{\xi});t_0,s_0))$ and, roughly speaking, this interaction sends singularities to $\mathcal{Y}((\vec{x},\vec{\xi});t_0,s_0)$. For instance, in Minkowski space, when three plane waves (whose singular supports are hyperplanes) collide, the intersections of the hyperplanes is a 1-dimensional space-like line $K_{123}=K_1\cap K_2\cap K_3$ in the 4-dimensional space-time. This corresponds to a point moving continuously in time. Roughly speaking, if we consider that light-like geodesics of (M,g) are world-curves of particles moving with the speed of light, we have that the point source produced by the 3rd interaction of the waves seems to move at a higher speed than light (i.e. it appears like a tachyonic, moving point source)and produces a (conic) shock wave type of singularity (see Fig. 3 where the interaction time is only finite). On visualization on this, see the supplementary video [82]. In this paper we do not analyze carefully the singularities produced by the three wave interaction near $\mathcal{Y}((\vec{x},\vec{\xi});t_0,s_0)$. Our goal is to consider the singularities produced by the four wave interaction in the domain $M_0\setminus\mathcal{Y}((\vec{x},\vec{\xi});t_0,s_0)$. To use this, we will later consider the limit when $s_0\to 0$. This means the "life time" of the moving point source that is of the order $O(s_0)$ becomes small and the set $\mathcal{Y}((\vec{x},\vec{\xi});t_0,s_0)$ tends to a variety whose Hausdorff dimension is only 2. Thus the exceptional set, on where we do not analyze the singularities, becomes smaller and smaller as $s_0\to 0$.

3.3.3. *Gaussian beams.* Our aim is to consider interactions of 4 waves that produce a new source. For this purpose we use test sources that produce gaussian beams.

Let $y\in V$ and $\eta\in T_yM$ be a future pointing light-like vector. We choose a complex function $p\in C^\infty(M_0)$ such that $\operatorname{Im}p(x)\geq 0$ and $\operatorname{Im}p(x)$ vanishes only at the point y such that $p(y)=0$, $d(\operatorname{Re}p)|_y=\eta^\sharp$, $d(\operatorname{Im}p)|_y=0$ and the Hessian of $\operatorname{Im}p$ at y is positive definite. To simplify notations, we use below complex sources and waves. The physical linearized waves can be obtained by taking the real part of these complex waves. We use a large parameter $\tau\in\mathbb{R}_+$ and define a test source

$$F_\tau(x)=F_\tau(x;y,\eta),\ \text{where}\quad F_\tau(x;y,\eta)=\tau^{-1}\exp(i\tau p(x))h(x) \tag{37}$$

with $h(x)$ supported in a small neighborhood $W\subset U$ of y. Examples how $p(x)$ and F_τ can be constructed is discussed in detail in [47].

We consider both the usual causal solutions and the solutions of the adjoint wave equation for which time is reversed, that is, we use the anti-causal parametrix $Q^* = Q_g^*$ instead of the usual causal parametrix $Q = \Box_g^{-1}$.

For a function $v : M_0 \to \mathbb{R}$, the large τ asymptotics of the L^2-inner products $\langle F_\tau, v\rangle_{L^2(M_0)}$ can be used to verify if the point $(y, \eta^\sharp) \in T^*M_0$ belongs in the wave front set $\mathrm{WF}(v)$ of v, see e.g. [65]. Below, we will use the fact that when v is of the form $v = Q_g b$, we have $\langle F_\tau, v\rangle_{L^2(M_0)} = \langle Q_g^* F_\tau, b\rangle_{L^2(M_0)}$ where $Q_g^* F_\tau$ is a Gaussian beam solution to the adjoint wave equation with source F_τ. We will use this to analyze the singularities of $\mathcal{U}^{(4)}$ at $y \in U$.

The wave $u_\tau = Q^* F_\tau$ satisfies by [65], see also [45],

$$\|u_\tau - u_\tau^N\|_{C^k(J^+(p)\cap J^-(q))} \le C_N \tau^{-n_{N,k}} \tag{38}$$

where $p, q \in M$, $n_{N,k} \to \infty$ as $N \to \infty$ and u_τ^N is a formal Gaussian beam of order N having the form

$$u_\tau^N(x) = e^{i\tau\varphi(x)} a(x,\tau), \quad a(x,\tau) = \sum_{n=0}^{N} U_n(x)\tau^{-n}. \tag{39}$$

Here $\varphi(x) = A(x) + iB(x)$ and $A(x)$ and $B(x)$ are real-valued functions, $B(x) \ge 0$, and $B(x)$ vanishes only on $\gamma_{y,\eta}(\mathbb{R})$, and for $z = \gamma_{y,\eta}(t)$, and $\zeta = \dot\gamma_{y,\eta}^\flat(t)$, $t < 0$ we have $dA|_z = \zeta$, $dB|_z = 0$. Moreover, the Hessian of B at z restricted to the orthocomplement of ζ is positive definite. The functions h and U_n defined above can be chosen to be smooth so that h is supported in any neighborhood of y and U_N are supported in any small neighborhood of $\gamma_{y,\eta}((-\infty, 0])$. Below, $a(x,\tau)$ is called the symbol and $U_0(y)$ is the principal symbol of the gaussian beam $u_\tau(x)$.

3.3.4. *Indicator function for singularities produced by interaction of four waves for non-linear wave equation.* Let $y \in U$ and $\eta \in L_y^+ M_0$ be a future pointing light-like vector. We will introduce an indicator function that can used to check whether $(y, \eta^\flat) \in \mathrm{WF}\,(\mathcal{U}^{(4)})$.

For the non-linear wave equation, we consider the indicator function

$$\Theta_\tau^{(4)} = \langle F_\tau, \mathcal{U}^{(4)}\rangle_{L^2(M_0)}, \tag{40}$$

where $\mathcal{U}^{(4)}$ is given by (35) with

$$u_j = Q_g f_j, \quad \text{where } f_j \in \mathcal{I}_C^{n+1}(Y(x_j, \xi_j; t_0, s_0)),\ n \le -n_1,\ j = 1,2,3,4,$$

and F_τ is the source producing a gaussian beam $u_\tau = Q_g^* F_\tau$ that propagates to the past along the geodesic $\gamma_{x_5,\xi_5}(\mathbb{R}_-)$, see (37). Using (35), we can write the indicator function as

$$\Theta_\tau^{(4)} = \sum_{\sigma\in\Sigma(4)} (T_{\tau,\sigma} + \widetilde{T}_{\tau,\sigma}), \tag{41}$$

where $\Sigma(4)$ is the set of permutations of the set $\{1,2,3,4\}$, and

$$\begin{aligned} T_{\tau,\sigma} &= -4\langle F_\tau, Q_g(au_{\sigma(4)} \cdot Q_g(au_{\sigma(3)} \cdot Q_g(au_{\sigma(2)} \cdot u_{\sigma(1)})))\rangle_{L^2(M_0)}, \\ \widetilde{T}_{\tau,\sigma} &= -\langle F_\tau, Q_g(aQ_g(au_{\sigma(4)} \cdot u_{\sigma(3)}) \cdot Q_g(au_{\sigma(2)} \cdot u_{\sigma(1)}))\rangle_{L^2(M_0)}, \end{aligned}$$

that can be written in the form

$$T_{\tau,\sigma} = -4\langle Q_g^*(u_\tau \cdot au_{\sigma(4)}), au_{\sigma(3)} \cdot Q_g(au_{\sigma(2)} \cdot u_{\sigma(1)})\rangle_{L^2(M_0)}, \tag{42}$$

$$\widetilde{T}_{\tau,\sigma} = -\langle u_\tau, aQ_g(au_{\sigma(4)} \cdot u_{\sigma(3)}) \cdot Q_g(au_{\sigma(2)} \cdot u_{\sigma(1)})\rangle_{L^2(M_0)}. \tag{43}$$

Here, $u_\tau = Q_g^* F_\tau$ is a gaussian beam. Observe that in (42) and (43), the inverse of the wave operator Q_g or its adjoint operates only on the products of two linearized waves. Hence we can below use the calculus developed in [28] to analyze these terms.

3.3.5. *Properties of the indicator functions on a general manifold.* Next we analyze the indicator function for sources $f_j \in \mathcal{I}_C^{n+1}(Y(x_j, \zeta_j; t_0, s_0))$, $j \leq 4$, and the source F_τ related to $(y, \eta) \in L^+M_0$, $y \in U$. We denote in the following $(x_5, \xi_5) = (y, \eta)$.

Definition 3.2. *Let $t_0 > 0$. We say that the geodesics corresponding to the vectors $(\vec{x}, \vec{\xi}) = ((x_j, \xi_j))_{j=1}^4$ intersect and the intersection takes place at the point $q \in M_0$ if there are $t_j \in (0, \mathbf{t}_j)$, $\mathbf{t}_j = \rho(x_j(t_0), \xi_j(t_0))$ such that $q = \gamma_{x_j,\xi_j}(t_0 + t_j)$ for all $j = 1, 2, 3, 4$.*

Let Λ_q^+ be the Lagrangian manifold

$$\Lambda_q^+ = \{(x, \xi) \in T^*M_0;\ x = \gamma_{q,\zeta}(t),\ \xi^\sharp = \dot{\gamma}_{q,\zeta}(t),\ \zeta \in L_q^+M_0,\ t > 0\}.$$

Note that the projection of Λ_q^+ on M_0 is the light cone ${}^+(q)$.

Next we consider $x_j \in U$ and $\xi_j \in L_{x_j}^+M_0$, and $\vartheta_1, t_0 > 0$ such that $(\vec{x}, \vec{\xi}) = ((x_j, \xi_j))_{j=1}^4$ satisfy, see Fig. 5(Right),

$$\begin{aligned} &(i)\ \gamma_{x_j,\xi_j}([0, t_0]) \subset U,\ x_j(t_0) \notin J^+(x_k(t_0)),\ \text{for } j, k \leq 4,\ j \neq k, \\ &(ii)\ \text{For all } j, k \leq 4,\ d_{g^+}((x_j, \xi_j), (x_k, \xi_k)) < \vartheta_1, \\ &(iii)\ \text{There is } \widehat{x} \in \widehat{\mu} \text{ such that for all } j \leq 4,\ d_{g^+}(\widehat{x}, x_j) < \vartheta_1, \end{aligned} \tag{44}$$

Above, $(x_j(t), \xi_j(t))$ are defined in (20). We denote

$$\mathcal{N}((\vec{x}, \vec{\xi}), t_0) = M_0 \setminus \bigcup_{j=1}^4 J^+(\gamma_{x_j(t_0),\xi_j(t_0)}(\mathbf{t}_j)), \tag{45}$$

where $\mathbf{t}_j := \rho(x_j(t_0), \xi_j(t_0))$. Note that two geodesics $\gamma_{x_j(t_0),\xi_j(t_0)}([0, \infty))$ can intersect at most once in $\mathcal{N}((\vec{x}, \vec{\xi}), t_0)$. We will analyze the singularities of the waves produced by the 4-wave interaction of waves in the set $\mathcal{N}((\vec{x}, \vec{\xi}), t_0)$ where all observed singularities are produced before the geodesics $\gamma_{x_j(t_0),\xi_j(t_0)}([0, \infty))$ have conjugate points, that is, before the waves u_j have caustics. These singularities of the waves are analyzed using the indicator function (41). Below we use $\sim$ for the terms

that have the same asymptotics up to an error $O(\tau^{-N})$ for all $N > 0$, as $\tau \to \infty$.

Theorem 3.3. *Let $(\vec{x}, \vec{\xi}) = ((x_j, \xi_j))_{j=1}^4$ be future pointing light-like vectors satisfying (44) and $t_0 > 0$. Let $x_5 \in \mathcal{N}((\vec{x}, \vec{\xi}), t_0) \cap U$ and (x_5, ξ_5) be a future pointing light-like vector such that $x_5 \notin \mathcal{Y}((\vec{x}, \vec{\xi}); t_0) \cup \bigcup_{j=1}^4 \gamma_{x_j,\xi_j}(\mathbb{R})$, see (36) and (45). When $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ is large enough and $s_0 > 0$ is small enough, the function $\Theta_\tau^{(4)}$, see (40) for the wave equation, satisfy the following:*
(i) If the geodesics corresponding to $(\vec{x}, \vec{\xi})$ either do not intersect or intersect at q and $(x_5, \xi_5) \notin \Lambda_q^+$, then

$$|\Theta_\tau^{(4)}| \leq C_N \tau^{-N}$$

for all $N > 0$. Moreover, x_5 has a neighborhood W such that $\mathcal{U}^{(4)}|_W$ is C^∞-smooth.
(ii) If the geodesics corresponding to $(\vec{x}, \vec{\xi})$ intersect at q, $q = \gamma_{x_j,\xi_j}(t_j)$ and the vectors $\dot\gamma_{x_j,\xi_j}(t_j)$, $j = 1, 2, 3, 4$ are linearly independent, and there are $t_5 < 0$ and $\xi_5 \in L_{x_5}^+ M_0$ such that $q = \gamma_{x_5,\xi_5}(t_5)$, then

$$\Theta_\tau^{(4)} \sim \sum_{k=m}^{\infty} s_k \tau^{-k}, \quad \text{as } \tau \to \infty. \tag{46}$$

Here, $m = -4n + 4$.

Moreover, let $b_j = (\dot\gamma_{x_j,\xi_j}(t_j))^\flat$, $j = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5$, and $\mathbf{b} = (b_j)_{j=1}^5 \in (L_q^{+,*} M_0)^5$. Let v_j be the principal symbols of the waves $u_j = Qf_j$ at (q, b_j) for $j \leq 4$. Also, let v_5 be the principal symbol of $u_\tau = Q^* F_\tau$ at (q, b_5), and $\mathbf{v} = (v_j)_{j=1}^5$. Then there is a real-analytic function $\mathcal{G}_{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{v})$, depending of the co-vectors $\mathbf{b}$, numbers $\mathbf{v}$, and the metric tensor $\mathbf{g} = g(q)$ at the point q, such that the leading order term in (46) satisfies

$$s_m = \mathcal{G}_{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{v}). \tag{47}$$

Observe that here $\mathbf{b}$ consists of five 4-vectors, $\mathbf{v}$ consists of five real numbers, and $\mathbf{g}$ can be represented as a symmetric 4×4 matrix.

(iii) Under the assumptions in (ii), the point x_5 has a neighborhood W such that $\mathcal{U}^{(4)}$ in W satisfies $\mathcal{U}^{(4)}|_W \in \mathcal{I}(\Lambda_q^+)$.

Later, we will show that the function $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{v})$ is not identically zero.

Proof. To simplify notations, we denote $K_j = K(x_j, \xi_j; t_0, s_0)$ and $K_{12} = K_1 \cap K_2$, $K_{124} = K_1 \cap K_2 \cap K_4$, etc, and $\mathcal{Y} = \mathcal{Y}((\vec{x}, \vec{\xi}); t_0)$ We will denote $\Lambda_j = \Lambda(x_j, \xi_j; t_0, s_0)$.

Let us assume that s_0 is so small that either the intersection $\gamma_{x_5,\xi_5}(\mathbb{R}_-) \cap (\cap_{j=1}^4 K_j)$ is empty or it consists of a point q. If the intersection happens, then K_j intersect transversally at q, as b_j are linearly independent.

We consider local coordinates $Z : W_0 \to \mathbb{R}^4$ such that $W_0 \subset \mathcal{N}((\vec{x}, \vec{\xi}), t_0)$ and if K_j intersects W_0, we assume that $K_j \cap W_0 = \{x \in W_0;\ Z^j(x) =$

$0\}$. Thus, $Z(q) = (0,0,0,0)$ if $q \in W_0$. Also, let $Y : W_1 \to \mathbb{R}^4$ be local coordinates that have the same properties as Z. We will denote $z^j = Z^j(x)$ and $y^j = Y^j(x)$. Let $\Phi_0 \in C_0^\infty(W_0)$ and $\Phi_1 \in C_0^\infty(W_1)$.

Recall that $Q = \Box_g^{-1}$. Let us next consider the map $Q^* : C_0^\infty(W_1) \to C^\infty(W_0)$. By [58], $Q^* \in I(W_1 \times W_0; \Delta'_{T^*M_0}, \Lambda_g)$ is an operator with a classical symbol and its canonical relation Λ'_{Q^*} is the union of two cleanly intersecting Lagrangian manifolds, $\Lambda'_{Q^*} = \Lambda'_g \cup \Delta_{T^*M_0}$, see [58]. Let $\varepsilon_2 > \varepsilon_1 > 0$ and $B_{\varepsilon_1,\varepsilon_2}$ be a pseudodifferential operator on M_0 which is microlocally a smoothing operator, i.e., the full symbol vanishes in local coordinates, outside in the conic ε_2-neighborhood $\mathcal{N}_2 \subset T^*M_0$ of the set of the light-like covectors L^*M_0, and for which $(I - B_{\varepsilon_1,\varepsilon_2})$ is microlocally smoothing operator in the conic ε_1-neighborhood $\mathcal{N}_1$ of the bundle of the light-like co-vectors L^*M_0. The conic ε-neighborhoods are the conic sets $\Gamma \subset L^*M_0$ such that $\Gamma \cap S^*M_0$ is the ε-neighborhood of $L^*M_0 \cap S^*M$ in the g^+-unit sphere bundle S^*M. Here, the distances are defined using the Sasaki metric determined by g^+. The parameters ε_1 and ε_2 are chosen later in the proof. Let us decompose the operator $Q^* = Q_1^* + Q_2^*$ where $Q_1^* = Q^*(I - B_{\varepsilon_1,\varepsilon_2})$ and $Q_2^* = Q^* B_{\varepsilon_1,\varepsilon_2}$. Then $Q_2^* \in I(W_1 \times W_0; \Delta'_{T^*M_0}, \Lambda_g)$ is an operator whose Schwartz kernel is a paired Lagrangian distribution, similarly to Q^*, see Sec. 3.2.1. There is a neighborhood $\mathcal{W}_2(\varepsilon_2)$ of $L^*M_0 \times L^*M_0 \subset (T^*M_0)^2$ such that the Schwartz kernel of the operator Q_2^* satisfies

$$\mathrm{WF}(Q_2^*) \subset \mathcal{W}_2 = \mathcal{W}_2(\varepsilon_2) \tag{48}$$

and $\mathcal{W}_2(\varepsilon_2)$ tends to the set $L^*M_0 \times L^*M_0$ as $\varepsilon_2 \to 0$. Moreover, $Q_1^* \in I(W_1 \times W_0; \Delta'_{T^*M_0})$ is a pseudodifferential operator with a classical symbol.

In the case when $p = 1$ we can write Q_p^* as

$$(Q_1^* v)(z) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{4+4}} e^{i(y-z)\cdot\xi} \sigma_{Q_1^*}(z,y,\xi) v(y)\, dy d\xi. \tag{49}$$

Here, $\sigma_{Q_1^*}(z,y,\xi) \in S_{cl}^{-2}(W_1 \times W_0; \mathbb{R}^4)$ is a classical symbol with the principal symbol

$$q_1(z,y,\xi) = \chi(z,\xi)(g^{jk}(z)\xi_j\xi_k)^{-1} \tag{50}$$

where $\chi(z,\xi) \in C^\infty$ vanishes in a neighborhood of light-like co-vectors.

Next we consider the terms of the type $T_\tau^{(4)}$ and $\widetilde{T}_\tau^{(4)}$ defined in (42) and (43) with permutation $\sigma = Id$. In these terms, we can represent the gaussian beam $u_\tau(y)$ in W_1 in the form

$$u_\tau(y) = e^{i\tau\varphi(y)} a_5(y,\tau) \tag{51}$$

where the function $\varphi : W_1 \to \mathbb{C}$ is a complex phase function having a non-negative imaginary part such that $\operatorname{Im}\varphi$ vanishes exactly on the geodesic $\gamma_{x_5,\xi_5} \cap W_1$ and $a_5 \in S_{cl}^0(W_1; \mathbb{R})$ is a classical symbol, see (39). For $y = \gamma_{x_5,\xi_5}(t) \in W_1$ we have $d\varphi(y) = c(t)\dot\gamma_{x_5,\xi_5}(t)^\flat$ with $c(t) \in \mathbb{R}\backslash\{0\}$.

Below, we denote $\kappa(j) = 0$ for $j = 1, 2, 3$ and $\kappa(4) = 1$ so that $U_j(x)$ is supported in $W_{\kappa(j)}$. We also denote $\kappa(5) = 1$.

In the computations below, we will replace the gaussian beam $u_\tau(x)$ by $U_\tau(x) = \Phi_1(x)u_\tau(x)$. Also, we replace the waves u_j by functions $U_j \in \mathcal{I}^{p_j}(K_j)$, $U_j(x) = \Phi_{\kappa(j)}(x)u_j(x)$, $j = 1, 2, 3, 4$, that are supported in $W_{\kappa(j)}$,

$$U_j(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{i\theta_j x^j} a_j(x, \theta_j) d\theta_j, \quad a_j \in S^{p_j}_{cl}(W_{\kappa(j)}; \mathbb{R}). \tag{52}$$

Note that in (52) there is no summing over the index j, and the symbols $a_j(z, \theta_j)$, $j \leq 3$ and $a_j(y, \theta_j)$, $j \in \{4, 5\}$ are scalar-valued symbols written in the Z and Y coordinates, respectively. Note that $p_j = n$ correspond to the case when $U_j \in \mathcal{I}^n(K_j) = \mathcal{I}^{n-1/2}(N^*K_j)$.

Next, we consider the asymptotics of terms $T^{(4)}_\tau$ and $\widetilde{T}^{(4)}_\tau$ of the type (42) and (43) where waves $u_j(x)$ are replaced by functions $U_j(x)$, gaussian beam $u_\tau(x)$ by $U_\tau(x)$, and the coefficient function $a(x)$ in the nonlinear term in the wave equation by the constant function having value one. Below, to simplify notations, we assume that the functions $U_j(x)$, that are conormal distributions associated to the surface K_j, have classical symbols $a_j(x, \theta_j)$ that are of the form $a_j(z, \theta_j) = \chi(\theta_j)\widehat{a}_j(z, \theta_j)$, where $\widehat{a}_j(z, s\theta_j) = s^{p_j}\widehat{a}_j(z, \theta_j)$ for $s > 0$ and $\chi(\theta_j) \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ is a function that vanish near $\theta_j = 0$ and is equal to 1 for $|\theta_j| \geq 1$. Here, $p_j \in \mathbb{Z}_-$. Then $a_j(x, \theta_j)$ are in $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^4 \times \mathbb{R})$, vanish near $\theta_j = 0$, are positively homogeneous for $|\theta_j| > 1$ and have principal symbols $\widehat{a}_j(y, \theta_j)$. General classical symbols $a_j(z, \theta_j)$, that can be written as a sum of finitely many such terms and a residual term that is in $S^{-N}_{1,0}(\mathbb{R}^4 \times \mathbb{R}^1)$ with large $N > 0$, can be analyzed in the same way with small modifications. When the claim is shown in this case, the asymptotics of the terms $T^{(4)}_\tau$ and $\widetilde{T}^{(4)}_\tau$, can be obtainded by using a suitable partition of unity.

Recall that $\Lambda_j = N^*K_j$ and denote $\Lambda_{jk} = N^*(K_j \cap K_k)$. By [28, Lem. 1.2 and 1.3], the pointwise product $U_2 \cdot U_1 \in \mathcal{I}(\Lambda_1, \Lambda_{12}) + \mathcal{I}(\Lambda_2, \Lambda_{12})$. By [28, Prop. 2.2 and 2.3], $Q(U_2 \cdot U_1) \in \mathcal{I}(\Lambda_1, \Lambda_{12}) + \mathcal{I}(\Lambda_2, \Lambda_{12})$ and it can be written as

$$G_{12}(z) := Q(U_2 \cdot U_1) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^{i(\theta_1 z^1 + \theta_2 z^2)} \sigma_{G_{12}}(z, \theta_1, \theta_2) d\theta_1 d\theta_2, \tag{53}$$

where $\sigma_{G_{12}}(z, \theta_1, \theta_2)$ is sum of product type symbols, see (26).

As $N^*(K_1 \cap K_2) \setminus (N^*K_1 \cup N^*K_2)$ consist of vectors which are non-characteristic for $\Box_g$, the principal symbol c_1 of G_{12} on $N^*(K_1 \cap K_2) \setminus (N^*K_1 \cup N^*K_2)$ is given by

$$c_1(z, \theta_1, \theta_2) = s(z, \theta_1, \theta_2)\widehat{a}_1(z, \theta_1)\widehat{a}_2(z, \theta_2), \tag{54}$$
$$s(z, \theta_1, \theta_2) = 1/g(\theta_1 b^{(1)} + \theta_2 b^{(2)}, \theta_1 b^{(1)} + \theta_2 b^{(2)}) = 1/(2g(\theta_1 b^{(1)}, \theta_2 b^{(2)})).$$

Next, we consider $T_\tau^{(4)} = \sum_{p=1}^2 T_{\tau,p}^{(4)}$ where $T_{\tau,p}^{(4)}$ is defined as $T_\tau^{(4)}$, in (42) with $\sigma = Id$, by replacing the term $Q^*(u_4 \cdot u_\tau)$ by $Q_p^*(U_4 \cdot U_\tau)$ and u_j by U_j. We consider different cases:

Case 1: Let us consider $T_{\tau,p}^{(4)}$ with $p = 2$, that is,

$$\begin{aligned} T_{\tau,2}^{(4)} &= \tau^4 \int_{\mathbb{R}^{12}} e^{i\tau\Psi_2(z,y,\theta)} \sigma_{G_{12}}(z, \tau\theta_1, \tau\theta_2) \cdot \\ &\quad \cdot a_3(z, \tau\theta_3) Q_2^*(z,y) a_4(y, \tau\theta_4) a_5(y,\tau)\, d\theta_1 d\theta_2 d\theta_3 d\theta_4 dy dz, \\ \Psi_2(z,y,\theta) &= \theta_1 z^1 + \theta_2 z^2 + \theta_3 z^3 + \theta_4 y^4 + \varphi(y), \end{aligned} \tag{55}$$

where $Q_2^*(z,y)$ is the Schwartz kernel of Q_2^* and $\theta = (\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3, \theta_4) \in \mathbb{R}^4$.

Case 1, step 1: Let first assume that (z, y, θ) is a critical point of Ψ_2 satisfying $\operatorname{Im}\varphi(y) = 0$. Then we have $\theta' = (\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3) = 0$ and $z' = (z^1, z^2, z^3) = 0$, $y^4 = 0$, $d_y\varphi(y) = (0, 0, 0, -\theta_4)$, implying that $y \in K_4$ and $(y, d_y\varphi(y)) \in N^*K_4$. As $\operatorname{Im}\varphi(y) = 0$, we have that $y = \gamma_{x_5,\xi_5}(s)$ with some $s \in \mathbb{R}_-$. Since we have $\dot\gamma_{x_5,\xi_5}(s)^\flat = d_y\varphi(y) \in N_y^*K_4$, we obtain $\gamma_{x_5,\xi_5}([s, 0]) \subset K_4$. However, this is not possible by our assumption that $x_5 \notin \cup_{j=1}^4 \gamma_{x_j,\xi_j}(\mathbb{R}_+)$ and thus $x_5 \notin \cup_{j=1}^4 K(x_j, \xi_j; s_0)$ when s_0 is small enough. Thus the phase function $\Psi_2(z, y, \theta)$ has no critical points satisfying $\operatorname{Im}\varphi(y) = 0$.

When the orders p_j of the symbols a_j are small enough, the integrals in the θ variable in (55) are convergent as Riemann integrals. Next we consider $\widetilde{Q}_2^*(z, y, \theta) = Q_2^*(z, y)$ that is constant in the θ variable. Below we denote $\psi_4(y, \theta_4) = \theta_4 y^4$ and $r = d\varphi(y)$.

Case 1, step 2: Assume that $((z, y, \theta), d_{z,y,\theta}\Psi_2) \in \mathrm{WF}(\widetilde{Q}_2^*)$ and $\operatorname{Im}\varphi(y) = 0$. Then we have $(z^1, z^2, z^3) = 0$, $y^4 = d_{\theta_4}\psi_4(y, \theta_4) = 0$ and $y \in \gamma_{x_5,\xi_5}$. Thus $z \in K_{123}$ and $y \in \gamma_{x_5,\xi_5} \cap K_4$.

Let us use the following notations

$$\begin{aligned} &z \in K_{123}, \quad \omega_\theta := (\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_2, 0) = \textstyle\sum_{j=1}^3 \theta_j dz^j \in T_z^*M_0, \\ &y \in K_4 \cap \gamma_{x_5,\xi_5}, \quad (y, w) := (y, d_y\psi_4(y, \theta_4)) \in N^*K_4, \\ &r = d\varphi(y) = r_j dy^j \in T_y^*M_0, \quad \kappa := r + w. \end{aligned} \tag{56}$$

Then, y and θ_4 satisfy $y^4 = d_{\theta_4}\psi_4(y, \theta_4) = 0$ and $w = (0, 0, 0, \theta_4)$. By the definition of the Y coordinates w is a light-like covector. Also, by the definition of the Z coordinates, $\omega_\theta \in N_z^*K_{123} = N_z^*K_1 + N_z^*K_2 + N_z^*K_3$.

Let us first consider what happens if $\kappa = r + w$ is light-like. In this case, all vectors κ, w, and r are light-like and satisfy $\kappa = r + w$. This is possible only if $r \parallel w$, i.e., r and w are parallel, see [70, Cor. 1.1.5]. Thus $r + w$ is light-like if and only if r and w are parallel.

Recall that we consider the case when $(z, y, \theta) \in W_1 \times W_0 \times \mathbb{R}^4$ is such that $((z, y, \theta), d_{z,y,\theta}\Psi_2) \in \mathrm{WF}(\widetilde{Q}_2^*)$ and $\operatorname{Im}\varphi(y) = 0$. Using the above notations (56), we obtain $d_{z,y,\theta}\Psi_2 = (\omega_\theta, r + w; (0, 0, 0, d_{\theta_4}\psi_4(y, \theta_4)))$,

where $y^4 = d_{\theta_4}\psi_4(y,\theta_4) = 0$ on N^*K_4, and thus

$$((z,\omega_\theta),(y,r+w)) \in \mathrm{WF}(Q_2^*) \subset \Lambda_g \cup \Delta'_{T^*M_0}. \tag{57}$$



FIGURE 6. **Left:** *The figure shows the case (A1) when three geodesics intersect at z and the waves propagating near these geodesics interact and create a wave that hits the fourth geodesic at the point y. The produced singularities are detected by the gaussian beam source at the point x_5. Note that z and y can be conjugate points on the geodesic connecting them. In the case (A2) the points y and z are the same.* **Right:** *Condition I is valid for the point y with vectors (x_j,ξ_j), $j = 1,2,3,4$ and with the parameter q. The redpoints are the conjugate points of $\gamma_{x_j,\xi_j}([t_0,\infty))$ and $\gamma_{q,\zeta}([0,\infty))$.*

Let γ_0 be the geodesic with $\gamma_0(0) = z$, $\dot\gamma_0(0) = \omega_\theta^\sharp$. We see that if $((z,\omega_\theta),(y,r+w)) \in \Lambda_g$ then

(A1) There is $s \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $(\gamma_0(s),\dot\gamma_0(s)^\flat) = (y,\kappa)$ and the vector κ is light-like.

On the other hand, if $((z,\omega_\theta),(y,r+w)) \in \Delta'_{T^*M_0}$, then

(A2) $z = y$ and $\kappa = -\omega_\theta$.

By (57) we see that either (A1) or (A2) has to be valid.

Case 1, step 2.A1: (See Fig. 6(Left)) Consider next the case when (A1) is valid. Since κ is light-like, r and w are parallel. Then, as $(\gamma_{x_5,\xi_5}(t_1),\dot\gamma_{x_5,\xi_5}(t_1)^\flat) = (y,r)$, we see that γ_0 is a continuation of the geodesic γ_{x_5,ξ_5}, that is, for some t_2 we have $(\gamma_{x_5,\xi_5}(t_2),\dot\gamma_{x_5,\xi_5}(t_2)) = (z,\omega_\theta) \in N^*K_{123}$. This implies that $x_5 \in \mathcal{Y}$ which is not possible by our assumptions. Hence (A1) is not possible.

Case 1, step 2.A2: Consider next the case when (A2) is valid. Let us first consider what would happen if κ is light-like. Then, we would have that $r \parallel w$. This implies that r is parallel to $\kappa = -\omega_\theta \in N^*K_{123}$, and as $(\gamma_{x_5,\xi_5}(t_1),\dot\gamma_{x_5,\xi_5}(t_1)^\flat) = (y,r)$, we would have $x_5 \in \mathcal{Y}$. This is not possible by our assumptions. Hence, $\omega_\theta = -\kappa$ is not light-like.

For any given $(\vec{x},\vec{\xi})$ and (x_5,ξ_5) there exists $\varepsilon_2>0$ so that $(\{(y,\omega_\theta)\}\times T^*M)\cap\mathcal{W}_2(\varepsilon_2)=\emptyset$, see (48), and thus

$$(\{(y,\omega_\theta)\}\times T^*M)\cap \mathrm{WF}(Q_2^*)=\emptyset. \tag{58}$$

Below, we assume that $\varepsilon_2>0$ is chosen so that (58) is valid. Then there are no (z,y,θ) such that $((z,y,\theta),d\Psi_2(z,y,\theta))\in \mathrm{WF}(\widetilde{Q}_2^*)$ and $\operatorname{Im}\varphi(y)=0$. Therefore Corollary 1.4 in [17] yields $T_{\tau,2}^{(4)}=O(\tau^{-N})$ for all $N>0$. This ends the analysis of the case $p=2$.

Case 2: Let us consider $T_{\tau,p}^{(4)}$ with $p=1$. Using (49), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} T_{\tau,1}^{(4)} &= \tau^8\int_{\mathbb{R}^{16}} e^{i\tau(\theta_1 z^1+\theta_2 z^2+\theta_3 z^3+(y-z)\cdot\xi+\theta_4 y^4+\varphi(y))}\sigma_{G_{12}}(z,\tau\theta_1,\tau\theta_2)\cdot \\ &\quad\cdot a_3(z,\tau\theta_3)\sigma_{Q_1^*}(z,y,\tau\xi)a_4(y,\tau\theta_4)a_5(y,\tau)\,d\theta_1 d\theta_2 d\theta_3 d\theta_4 dy dz d\xi. \end{aligned} \tag{59}$$

Next, assume that $(\overline{z},\overline{\theta},\overline{y},\overline{\xi})$ is a critical point of the phase function

$$\Psi_3(z,\theta,y,\xi)=\theta_1 z^1+\theta_2 z^2+\theta_3 z^3+(y-z)\cdot\xi+\theta_4 y^4+\varphi(y). \tag{60}$$

Denote $\overline{w}=(0,0,0,\overline{\theta}_4)$ and $\overline{r}=d\varphi(\overline{y})=\overline{r}_j dy^j$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} &\partial_{\theta_j}\Psi_3=0,\ j=1,2,3 \quad \text{yields} \quad \overline{z}\in K_{123},\\ &\partial_{\theta_4}\Psi_3=0 \quad \text{yields} \quad \overline{y}\in K_4,\\ &\partial_z\Psi_3=0 \quad \text{yields} \quad \overline{\xi}=\omega_{\overline{\theta}}:=\textstyle\sum_{j=1}^3\overline{\theta}_j dz^j,\\ &\partial_\xi\Psi_3=0 \quad \text{yields} \quad \overline{y}=\overline{z},\\ &\partial_y\Psi_3=0 \quad \text{yields} \quad \overline{\xi}=-\overline{r}-\overline{w}. \end{aligned} \tag{61}$$

The critical points we need to consider for the asymptotics satisfy also

$$\operatorname{Im}\varphi(\overline{y})=0,\ \text{so that } \overline{y}\in\gamma_{x_5,\xi_5},\ \operatorname{Im}d\varphi(\overline{y})=0,\quad \operatorname{Re}d\varphi(\overline{y})\in L^*_{\overline{y}}M_0. \tag{62}$$

Let us use the notations similar to (56). By (61) and (62),

$$\overline{z}=\overline{y}\in\gamma_{x_5,\xi_5}\cap\bigcap_{j=1}^4 K_j,\ \overline{\xi}=\sum_{j=1}^3\overline{\theta}_j dz^j=-\overline{r}-\overline{w}. \tag{63}$$

Case 2.1: Consider the case when all the four geodesics γ_{x_j,ξ_j} intersect at the point q. Then, as $x_5\notin\mathcal{Y}$, we have $\overline{r}=d\varphi(\overline{y})$ is such that in the Y-coordinates $\overline{r}=\overline{r}_j dy^j$ with $\overline{r}_j\neq 0$ for all $j=1,2,3,4$. Thus the existence of the critical point $(\overline{z},\overline{\theta},\overline{y},\overline{\xi})$ of $\Psi_3(z,\theta,y,\xi)$ implies that there exists an intersection point of γ_{x_5,ξ_5} and $\bigcap_{j=1}^4 K_j$.

Next we consider the case (63) where $(\overline{y},\overline{z},\overline{\xi},\overline{\theta})$ is a critical point of Ψ_3. In particular, then $\overline{y}=\overline{z}$. Thus we may assume for a while that $W_0=W_1$ and that the Y-coordinates and Z-coordinates coincide, that is, $Y(x)=Z(x)$. Then $Y(\overline{y})=Z(\overline{z})=0$ and the covectors $dz^j=dZ^j$ and $dy^j=dY^j$ at $\overline{y}$ coincide for $j=1,2,3,4$. Moreover, (63) imply that

$$\overline{r}=\sum_{j=1}^4\overline{r}_j dy^j=-\omega_{\overline{\theta}}-\overline{w}=-\sum_{j=1}^3\overline{\theta}_j dz^j-\overline{\theta}_4 dy^4,$$

so that

$$\overline{r}_j = -\overline{\theta}_j, \quad \text{i.e., } \overline{\theta} := \overline{\theta}_j dz^j = -\overline{r} = \overline{r}_j dy^j \in T^*_{\overline{y}} M_0. \tag{64}$$

Using the method of stationary phase similarly to the proof of [32, Thm. 3.4] and the fact that $\det(\mathrm{Hess}_{z,y,\theta,\xi}\Psi_3) = 1$ we obtain, in the Y coordinates where $Y(\overline{y}) = 0$,

$$T^{(4)}_\tau \sim \tau^{-4+\rho} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} c_k \tau^{-k}, \quad \text{where} \tag{65}$$

$$c_0 = \widehat{C} c_1(0, -\overline{r}_1, -\overline{r}_2)\widehat{a}_3(0, -\overline{r}_3) q_1(0,0,-(\overline{r}_1, \overline{r}_2, \overline{r}_3, 0))\widehat{a}_4(0, -\overline{r}_4)\widehat{a}_5(0,1),$$

and $\widehat{C} \neq 0$, $\rho = \sum_{j=1}^4 p_j$, and $\widehat{a}_j(0,\theta_j)$, $j \leq 4$ and $\widehat{a}_5(0,1)$ are the principal symbols of U_j and u_τ at $Y(\overline{y}) = 0$, respectively. Above, q_1 is given in (50) and c_1 in (54). Also, observe that $\overline{r} = d\varphi(\overline{y})$ depends only on g and $\mathbf{b}$, and thus we write below $\overline{r} = \overline{r}(\mathbf{b})$. Also, $(\overline{r}_1, \overline{r}_2, \overline{r}_3, 0)$ is not light-like and hence the nominator of q_1 does not vanish in (65).

Case 2.2: If $\Psi_3(z,\theta,y,\xi)$ has no critical points, that is, there are no intersection points of the five geodesics γ_{x_j,ξ_j}, $j = 1,2,\dots,5$, we obtain the asymptotics $T^{(4)}_{\tau,1} = O(\tau^{-N})$ for all $N > 0$.

Case 3: Next, we consider the terms $\widetilde{T}^{(4),}_\tau$ of the type (43). Such term is an integral of the product of u_τ and the terms $Q(U_2 \cdot U_1)$ and $Q(U_4 \cdot U_3)$. The last two factors can be written in the form (53). Assume that Ψ_3 has a critical point $(\overline{z}, \overline{\theta}, \overline{y}, \overline{\xi})$. Then, $\widetilde{T}^{(4)}_\tau$ has similar asymptotics to $T^{(4)}_\tau$ as $\tau \to \infty$, with the leading order coefficient $\widetilde{c}_0 = \widehat{C}\, c_1(0, -\overline{r}_1, -\overline{r}_2) c_2(0, -\overline{r}_3, -\overline{r}_4)$ where $\overline{r} = \overline{r}(\mathbf{b})$ and c_2 is given as in (54) with principal symbols $\widehat{a}_3$ and $\widehat{a}_4$.

In the above computations based on the method of stationary phase, we obtain the leading order coefficient s_m in (46) by evaluating the integrated function at the critical point $(\overline{z}, \overline{\theta}, \overline{y}, \overline{\xi})$. For example, denoting again $\overline{r} = d\varphi(\overline{y})$, the term (59) gives,

$$T^{(4)}_{\tau,id} = \frac{C\tau^{-4-\rho}(1 + O(\tau^{-1}))}{\overline{r}_1 \overline{r}_2 g(b^{(1)}, b^{(2)}) \left(\sum_{j,k=1}^3 g^{jk}(0)\overline{r}_j \overline{r}_k\right)} v_{(5)} v_{(4)} v_{(3)} v_{(2)} v_{(1)}. \tag{66}$$

This shows that s_m coincides with some real-analytic function $G(\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{v})$. This proves (ii).

(iii) Assume that γ_{x_j,ξ_j}, $j = 1,2,3,4$ intersect at the point q. Using formulas (52) and (53) we have that near q in the Y coordinates $\mathcal{U}^{(4)} = Q\mathcal{S}^{(4)}$, where

$$\mathcal{S}^{(4)}(y) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^4} e^{iy^j\theta_j} b(y,\theta)\, d\theta. \tag{67}$$

Recall that here in the Y-coordinates K_j is given by $\{y^j = 0\}$ and $b(y,\theta)$ is a finite sum of terms that are products of product type symbols.

Let us choose sufficiently small $\varepsilon_3 > 0$ and $\chi(\theta) \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^4)$ that is positive homogeneous of order zero in the domain $|\theta| > 1$, vanishes in a conic ε_3-neighborhood (in the g^+ metric) of $\mathcal{A}_q$,

$$\mathcal{A}_q \ := \ N_q^* K_{123} \cup N_q^* K_{134} \cup N_q^* K_{124} \cup N_q^* K_{234} \tag{68}$$

and is equal to 1 outside the union of the conic $(2\varepsilon_3)$-neighborhood of the set $\mathcal{A}_q$ and the set where $|\theta| < 1/2$.

Let $\phi \in C_0^\infty(W_1)$ be a function that is one near q. Then, considering carefully the construction of the symbol $b(y,\theta)$, we see that $b_0(y,\theta) = \phi(y)\chi(\theta)b(y,\theta)$ is a classical symbol of order $p = \sum_{j=1}^4 p_j$. Let $\mathcal{S}^{(4),0}(y) \in \mathcal{I}^{p-4}(\{q\})$ be the conormal distribution that is given by the formula (67) with $b(y,\theta)$ being replaced by $b_0(y,\theta)$.

Using the above computations based on the method of stationary phase and [56], we see that the function $\mathcal{U}^{(4)} - Q\mathcal{S}^{(4),0}$ has no wave front set in $T^*(U)$, where $W \subset U \setminus (\mathcal{Y} \cup \bigcup_{j=1}^4 K_j))$ is a neighborhood of x_5, and thus it is a C^∞-smooth function in U.

By [28], $Q : \mathcal{I}^{p-4}(\{q\}) \to \mathcal{I}^{p-4-3/2,-1/2}(N^*(\{q\}), \Lambda_q^+)$, which proves that $Q\mathcal{S}^{(4),0}|_W$ and thus $\mathcal{U}^{(4)}|_W$ are in $\mathcal{I}^{p-4-3/2}(\Lambda_q^+)$. □

Remark 3.2. The claim and the proof of Theorem 3.3 generalizes directly to semilinear systems of the form $\Box_g \vec{u}(x) + V(x, \vec{u}(x), \partial\vec{u}(x)) = \vec{f}(x)$, where $\vec{u}(x)$ is $\mathbb{R}^m$-valued and $V : M \times \mathbb{R}^m \times (\mathbb{R}^{m\times 4}) \to \mathbb{R}^m$ is a smooth function.

Next we will show that $\mathcal{G}_{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{v})$ is not vanishing identically. This implies that at the point of interaction of the four waves a new wave is produced.

3.4. **Non-vanishing interaction in the Minkowski space.**

3.4.1. *Plane waves in the Minkowski space.* To show that the function $\mathcal{G}_{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{v})$, see (47), is not vanishing identically, we will next consider the case of the Minkowski space. Observe that we can choose the local coordinates so that the metric tensor $g(q)$ at the interaction point q is the standard Minkowski metric. Then the function $\mathcal{G}_{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{v})$ depends only on the covectors $\mathbf{b}$ and the numbers $\mathbf{v}$, not on the manifold M or the metric g. Thus to show that it is not identically vanishing, it is enough to analyze the case when (M, g) is the Minkowski space.

In this section, $x = (x^0, x^1, x^3, x^4)$ are the standard coordinates in Minkowski space and $g_{jk} = \text{diag}\,(-1, 1, 1, 1)$ denote the metric in the standard coordinates of the Minkowski space $\mathbb{R}^4$. Below we call the principal symbols $v^{(j)}$ of the linearized waves the *polarizations* to emphasize their physical meaning. We denote $\mathbf{v} = (v^{(j)})_{j=1}^5$.

For the non-linear wave equation, $v^{(j)}$ are non-zero real numbers.

We assume that the waves $u_j(x)$, $j = 1, 2, 3, 4$, solving the linear wave equation in the Minkowski space, are of the form

$$u_j(x) = v^{(j)} \left(b_p^{(j)} x^p \right)_+^\ell, \quad t_+^\ell = |t|^\ell H(t), \tag{69}$$

where $b_p^{(j)} dx^p$, $p = 1, 2, 3, 4$ are four linearly independent light-like co-vectors of $\mathbb{R}^4$, $\ell > 0$ and $v^{(j)}$ are real numbers. Above, $H(s)$ is the Heaviside function. We also assume that $b^{(5)}$ is not in the linear span of any three vectors $b^{(j)}$, $j = 1, 2, 3, 4$. In the following, we denote $b^{(j)} \cdot x := b_p^{(j)} x^p$ and $\mathbf{b} = (b^{(j)})_{j=1}^5$.

Let us next consider the wave produced by interaction of two plane wave solutions in the Minkowski space.

Let $b^{(1)}$ and $b^{(2)}$ be light like co-vectors. We use the notations

$$u^{\ell_1,\ell_2}(x; b^{(1)}, b^{(2)}) = (b^{(1)} \cdot x)_+^{\ell_1} \cdot (b^{(2)} \cdot x)_+^{\ell_2} \tag{70}$$

for a product of two plane waves. We define the formal parametrix Q_0 of the operator $\Box_g$ by setting

$$Q_0(u^{\ell_1,\ell_2}(x; b^{(1)}, b^{(2)})) = \frac{u^{\ell_1+1,\ell_2+1}(x; b^{(1)}, b^{(2)})}{2(\ell_1+1)(\ell_2+1)\, g(b^{(1)}, b^{(2)})}. \tag{71}$$

Then $\Box_g(Q_0(u^{\ell_1,\ell_2}(x; b^{(1)}, b^{(2)}))) = u^{\ell_1,\ell_2}(x; b^{(1)}, b^{(2)})$. Also, let

$$\begin{aligned} u_\tau^\ell(x; b^{(4)}, b^{(5)}) &= u_4(x)\, u_\tau(x), \quad u_4(x) = (b^{(4)} \cdot x)_+^\ell, \\ u_\tau(x) &= e^{i\tau\, b^{(5)} \cdot x}, \end{aligned} \tag{72}$$

so that $\Box_g(u_\tau^\ell(x; b^{(4)}, b^{(5)})) = 2\ell\, g(b^{(4)}, b^{(5)}) i\tau\, u_\tau^{\ell-1,0}(x; b^{(4)}, b^{(5)})$. Let

$$Q_0(u_\tau^\ell(x; b^{(4)}, b^{(5)})) = \frac{1}{2i(\ell+1)\, g(b^{(4)}, b^{(5)})\tau} u_\tau^{\ell+1}(x; b^{(4)}, b^{(5)}). \tag{73}$$

3.4.2. *WKB computations and the indicator functions in the Minkowski space.* Let $b^{(j)}$, $j = 1, 2, 3, 4$ be linearly independent light-like co-vectors and $b^{(5)}$ be a light-like co-vector that is not in the linear span of any three vectors $b^{(j)}$, $j = 1, 2, 3, 4$. Also, let $\mathbf{v} = (v^{(j)})_{j=1}^5$ be the vector obtained from the polarizations $v^{(j)}$ of the waves $u_j(x)$, $j \le 4$ and $v^{(5)}$ be the polarization $u_\tau(x)$. In the Minkowski space we assume that the function $a(x)$ in the quadratic non-linearity is equal to the constant $a(x_0)$ where $x_0 = 0$ is the point where the planes $x^j = 0$ intersect.

For the non-linear wave equation, we define the (Minkowski) indicator function (c.f. (41) and (42)-(43))

$$\mathcal{G}^{(\mathbf{m})}(\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{v}) = \lim_{\tau\to\infty} \tau^{-4n+4} \Big(\sum_{\sigma\in\Sigma(4)} T_{\tau,\sigma}^{(\mathbf{m})} + \widetilde{T}_{\tau,\sigma}^{(\mathbf{m})} \Big), \tag{74}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} T_{\tau,\sigma}^{(\mathbf{m})} &= -4\langle Q_0(u_\tau \cdot a u_{\sigma(4)}), h \cdot a u_{\sigma(3)} \cdot Q_0(a u_{\sigma(2)} \cdot u_{\sigma(1)}) \rangle_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^4)}, \\ \widetilde{T}_{\tau,\sigma}^{(\mathbf{m})} &= -\langle u_\tau, ha\, Q_0(a u_{\sigma(4)} \cdot\, u_{\sigma(3)}) \cdot Q_0(a u_{\sigma(2)} \cdot\, u_{\sigma(1)}) \rangle_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^4)}, \end{aligned} \tag{75}$$

and u_j are given by (69) with $\ell = -n-1$, $j = 1,2,3,4$. Here, the compactly supported cut-off function $h(x)$ has been added due to the fact that in formulas (42)-(43) the intersection of the supports of the distorted plane waves and the gaussian beam is compact but in the Minkowski space the plane waves u_j are supported in the half-space and u_τ in the whole space. Above, the super-index $(\mathbf{m})$ refers to the word "Minkowski". Let $\mathbf{g}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{4\times 4}$ denote the standard Minkowski metric of $\mathbb{R}^4$. By analyzing the microlocal computations done in the proof of Thm. 3.3, we have that $\mathcal{G}_{\mathbf{g}_0}(\mathbf{b},\mathbf{v}) = \mathcal{G}^{(\mathbf{m})}(\mathbf{b},\mathbf{v})$.

Proposition 3.4. *Let $b^{(5)}$ be a future pointing light-like vector in the Minkowski space $\mathbb{R}^4$ and*

$$\mathcal{X}(b^{(5)}) \;=\; \{((b^{(j)})_{j=1}^5, (v^{(j)})_{j=1}^5) \in (L_0^{*,+}\mathbb{R}^4)^5 \times \mathbb{R}^5;\ (b^{(j)})_{j=1}^4 \text{ are linearly independent light-like vectors}\}.$$

For the wave equation the indicator function $(\mathbf{b},\mathbf{v}) \mapsto \mathcal{G}^{(\mathbf{m})}(\mathbf{b},\mathbf{v})$, given in (74) and defined for $(\mathbf{b},\mathbf{v}) \in \mathcal{X}(b^{(5)})$ is a real-analytic function that does not vanish in any relatively open subset of $\mathcal{X}(b^{(5)})$.

Proof. Without loss of generality, we can fix $b^{(5)}$ to be any light-like vector in $\mathbb{R}^4$. We use light-like vectors $b^{(j)}$ that in the standard coordinates of the Minkowski space $\mathbb{R}^4$ can be written as

$$b^{(5)} = (1,1,0,0), \quad b^{(j)} = (1, 1-\frac{1}{2}\rho_j^2, \rho_j + O(\rho_j^3), \rho_j^3), \tag{76}$$

where $j = 1,2,3,4$, and $\rho_j \in (0,1)$ are small parameters. With an appropriate choice of $O(\rho_k^3)$ above, the vectors $b^{(k)}$ are light-like and

$$g(b^{(5)}, b^{(j)}) = -\frac{1}{2}\rho_j^2, \quad g(b^{(k)}, b^{(j)}) = -\frac{1}{2}\rho_k^2 - \frac{1}{2}\rho_j^2 + O(\rho_k\rho_j). \tag{77}$$

Below, we denote $\omega_{kj} = g(b^{(k)}, b^{(j)})$ and we assume that $v^{(j)} \neq 0$. Note that if $\rho_j < \rho_k^4$, we have $\omega_{kj} = -\frac{1}{2}\rho_k^2 + O(\rho_k^3)$. Also, we use $\ell \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ that is large enough and $n = -\ell - 1$.

We use the parameters ρ_j (we use here the "unordered" numbering 4-2-1-3)

$$\rho_4 = \rho_2^{100},\ \rho_2 = \rho_1^{100},\ \text{and } \rho_1 = \rho_3^{100}. \tag{78}$$

Below in this proof, we denote $\vec{\rho} \to 0$ when $\rho_3 \to 0$ and ρ_4, ρ_2, and ρ_1 are defined using ρ_3 as in (78).

Next we analyze the terms in (74), that is,

$$\Theta_\tau^{(\mathbf{m})} = \sum_{\sigma\in\Sigma(4)} (T_{\tau,\sigma}^{(\mathbf{m})} + \widetilde{T}_{\tau,\sigma}^{(\mathbf{m})}).$$

We denote $T_\tau^{(\mathbf{m})} = T_{\tau,id}^{(\mathbf{m})}$ and $\widetilde{T}_\tau^{(\mathbf{m})} = \widetilde{T}_{\tau,id}^{(\mathbf{m})}$.

Let us first consider the case when the permutation $\sigma = id$. Then, see (69) and (72),

$$\begin{aligned} T_\tau^{(\mathbf{m})} &= -4\langle Q_0(au_4 \cdot u_\tau), h \cdot au_3 \cdot Q_0(au_2 \cdot u_1)\rangle \\ &= C\frac{\mathcal{P}}{\omega_{45}\tau}\frac{1}{\omega_{12}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^4}(b^{(4)}\cdot x)_+^{\ell+1}e^{i\tau(b^{(5)}\cdot x)}h(x)(b^{(3)}\cdot x)_+^{\ell}\cdot \\ &\qquad \cdot (b^{(2)}\cdot x)_+^{\ell+1}(b^{(1)}\cdot x)_+^{\ell+1}\,dx, \end{aligned} \tag{79}$$

where $\mathcal{P} = a^3\prod_{j=1}^5 v^{(j)}$ is the product of a^3 and the principal symbols of the waves u_j at zero. Moreover, $C \neq 0$ is a generic constant that may depend on ℓ but not on $b^{(j)}$ or $v^{(j)}$.

Let us use in $\mathbb{R}^4$ the coordinates $y = (y^1, y^2, y^3, y^4)^t$ where $y^j = b_k^{(j)}x^k$ and let $A = A_{\vec\rho} \in \mathbb{R}^{4\times 4}$ be the matrix for which $y = A^{-1}x$. Then $K_j = \{y^j = 0\}$ are light-like hyperplanes. Let $\mathbf{p} = (A^{-1})^t b^{(5)}$ so that $b^{(5)}\cdot x = \mathbf{p}\cdot y$. In the y-coordinates, $b^{(j)} = dy^j$ for $j \le 4$ and $b^{(5)} = \sum_{j=1}^4 \mathbf{p}_j dy^j$ and

$$\mathbf{p}_j = g(b^{(5)}, dy^j) = g(b^{(5)}, b^{(j)}) = \omega_{j5} = -\frac{1}{2}\rho_j^2.$$

Due to (78), $\det(A_{\vec\rho})$ is non-vanishing when ρ_3 is small enough. In the y, coordinates, (79) gives

$$T_\tau^{(\mathbf{m})} = \frac{C\mathcal{P}}{\omega_{45}\tau}\frac{\det(A)}{\omega_{12}}\int_{(\mathbb{R}_+)^4} e^{i\tau\mathbf{p}\cdot y}h(Ay)y_4^{\ell+1}y_3^{\ell}y_2^{\ell+1}y_1^{\ell+1}\,dy.$$

Using repeated integration by parts and that $e^{i\tau\mathbf{p}\cdot y} = \frac{1}{i\tau\mathbf{p}_j}\frac{\partial}{\partial y_j}e^{i\tau\mathbf{p}\cdot y}$ and $\int_{\mathbb{R}_+}\widetilde{h}(y_j)e^{i\tau p_j y_j}dy_j = -(i\tau p_j)^{-1} + O(\tau^{-\infty})$, where $\widetilde{h} \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ has value one near zero, we see from (77) that

$$\begin{aligned} T_\tau^{(\mathbf{m})} &= C_1\det(A_{\vec\rho})\cdot(i\tau)^m(1+O(\frac{1}{\tau}))\vec\rho^{\,2\vec n}(\omega_{45}\omega_{12})^{-1}\rho_4^{-4}\rho_2^{-4}\rho_1^{-4}\rho_3^{-2}\cdot\mathcal{P} \\ &= C_2\det(A_{\vec\rho})\cdot(i\tau)^m(1+O(\frac{1}{\tau}))\vec\rho^{\,2\vec n}\rho_4^{-4-2}\rho_2^{-4}\rho_1^{-4-2}\rho_3^{-2}\cdot\mathcal{P} \end{aligned} \tag{80}$$

where $\vec n = (n,n,n,n)$, $\vec\rho^{\,2\vec n} = \rho_1^{2n}\rho_2^{2n}\rho_3^{2n}\rho_4^{2n}$, and C_1 and C_2 are non-vanishing functions of a. Similarly, a direct computation yields

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{T}_\tau^{(\mathbf{m})} &= -\langle u_\tau, ha\,Q_0(au_{\sigma(4)}\cdot u_{\sigma(3)})\cdot Q_0(au_{\sigma(2)}\cdot u_{\sigma(1)})\rangle \\ &= \frac{C\mathcal{P}}{\omega_{34}\omega_{12}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^4} e^{i\tau b^{(5)}\cdot x}h(x)(b^{(4)}\cdot x)_+^{\ell+1}(b^{(3)}\cdot x)_+^{\ell+1}(b^{(2)}\cdot x)_+^{\ell+1}(b^{(1)}\cdot x)_+^{\ell+1}dx \\ &= \widetilde{C}_1\det(A_{\vec\rho})\cdot(i\tau)^n(1+O(\frac{1}{\tau}))\vec\rho^{\,2\vec n}(\omega_{43}\omega_{21})^{-1}\rho_4^{-4}\rho_2^{-4}\rho_1^{-4}\rho_3^{-4}\cdot\mathcal{P} \\ &= \widetilde{C}_2\det(A_{\vec\rho})\cdot(i\tau)^m(1+O(\frac{1}{\tau}))\vec\rho^{\,2\vec n}\rho_4^{-4}\rho_2^{-4}\rho_1^{-4-2}\rho_3^{-4-2}\cdot\mathcal{P}, \end{aligned} \tag{81}$$

where $\mathcal{P} = a^3\prod_{j=1}^5 v^{(j)}$ and $\widetilde{C}_1$ and $\widetilde{C}_2$ are non-vanishing.

Let us now consider permutations σ of the indexes $\{1,2,3,4\}$ and compare the terms

$$L_\sigma^{(\mathbf{m})}(\vec{\rho},\mathbf{v}) = \lim_{\tau\to\infty} \tau^m T_{\tau,\sigma}^{(\mathbf{m})}, \quad \widetilde{L}_\sigma^{(\mathbf{m})}(\vec{\rho},\mathbf{v}) = \lim_{\tau\to\infty} \tau^m \widetilde{T}_{\tau,\sigma}^{(\mathbf{m})}.$$

A direct computation using (80)-(81) and comparing the power of ρ_4, shows that all the terms $\widetilde{L}_{\tau,\sigma}^{(\mathbf{m})}/L_{\tau,id}^{(\mathbf{m})} \to 0$ as $\vec{\rho}\to 0$, see (78). Also, if $\sigma \neq (1,2,3,4)$ and $\sigma \neq \sigma_1 = (2,1,3,4)$, we see by doing a direct computation and comparing the powers of all ρ_j that $L_{\tau,\sigma}^{(\mathbf{m})}/L_{\tau,id}^{(\mathbf{m})} \to 0$ as $\vec{\rho}\to 0$. Also, we observe that $L_{\tau,\sigma_1}^{(\mathbf{m})} = L_{\tau,id}^{(\mathbf{m})}$. Thus we have that the terms $L_{\tau,\sigma_1}^{(\mathbf{m})} = L_{\tau,id}^{(\mathbf{m})}$ that have the strongest asymptotics as $\vec{\rho}\to 0$ and that when $\mathcal{P}\neq 0$ the sum

$$S(\vec{\rho},\mathbf{v}) = \sum_{\sigma\in\Sigma(4)} (L_{\tau,\sigma}^{(\mathbf{m})}(\vec{\rho},\mathbf{v}) + \widetilde{L}_{\tau,\sigma}^{(\mathbf{m})}(\vec{\rho},\mathbf{v}))$$

is non-zero when $\rho_3 > 0$ is small enough and ρ_4, ρ_2, and ρ_1 are defined using ρ_3 as in (78). This shows that the indicator function $\mathcal{G}^{(\mathbf{m})}(\mathbf{b},\mathbf{v})$ is a real-analytic function that is not identically vanishing in the topological component $\mathcal{X}(b^{(5)})$ that contain $(\mathbf{b},\mathbf{v})$ where $\mathbf{b}$ are given by (76). The claim for the other topological components follow using a permutation of the vectors $b^{(j)}$. □

3.5. **Detection of singularities.** We use now the results above to detect singularities of waves produced by the 4th order interaction in the set U, defined in (11). We say that the *interaction condition* (I) is satisfied for $y\in U$ with light-like vectors $(\vec{x},\vec{\xi}) = ((x_j,\xi_j))_{j=1}^4$ and $t_0\geq 0$, with parameters (q,ζ,t), if

(I) *There exist* $q\in\bigcap_{j=1}^4 \gamma_{x_j(t_0),\xi_j(t_0)}((0,\mathbf{t}_j))$, *where* $\mathbf{t}_j = \rho(x_j(t_0),\xi_j(t_0))$, *and* $\zeta\in L_q^+M_0$ *and* $t\geq 0$ *such that* $y=\gamma_{q,\zeta}(t)$.

Below, we use the symbol class $\mathcal{I}_C^{n+1}(Y(x_0,\zeta_0;t_0,s_0))$ defined after Lemma 3.1 and in (32). For $f_1\in\mathcal{I}_C^{n+1}(Y((x_1,\xi_1);t_0,s_0))$ the wave $Qf_1 = u_1$ is a solution of the linear wave equation. Thus, when f_1 runs through the set $\mathcal{I}_C^{n+1}(Y((x_1,\xi_1);t_0,s_0))$ the union of the sets $\mathrm{WF}\,(Qf_1)$ is the manifold $\Lambda((x_1,\xi_1);t_0,s_0)$. Thus, L_U determines $\Lambda((x_1,\xi_1);t_0,s_0))\cap T^*U$. In particular, using these data we can determine the geodesic segments $\gamma_{x_1,\xi_1}(\mathbb{R}_+)\cap U$ for all $x_1\in U$, $\xi_1\in L^+M_0$.

Below, in TM_0 we use the Sasaki metric corresponding to the Riemannian metric g^+. Moreover, let $r_2>0$ be sufficiently small, $s'\in(s_-+r_2,s_+)$, and $B_j\subset U$ be open sets such that, cf. (34), we have

$$\begin{aligned} &B_j \subset\subset I(\mu_g(s'-r_2),\mu_g(s'))\subset U, \text{ and} \\ &B_j\cap J^+(B_k)=\emptyset \text{ for all } j\neq k. \end{aligned} \tag{82}$$

Next we formulate a condition (D) that is valid when we can detect singularities at a given point $y \in U$. We define that point $y \in U$, satisfies the singularity *detection condition* (D) with light-like directions $(\vec{x}, \vec{\xi})$ and $t_0, \widehat{s} > 0$ if

(**D**) *For any $s, s_0 \in (0, \widehat{s})$ and $j = 1, 2, 3, 4$ there exists (x'_j, ξ'_j) in the s-neighborhood of (x_j, ξ_j), open sets $B_j \subset B_{g^+}(\gamma_{x'_j,\xi'_j}(t_0), s)$ satisfying (82), and $f_j \in \mathcal{I}^{n+1}_C(Y((x'_j, \xi'_j); t_0, s_0))$, $supp\,(f_j) \subset B_j$, such that if $u_{\vec{\varepsilon}}$ is the solution of (22) with the source $f_{\vec{\varepsilon}} = \sum_{j=1}^4 \varepsilon_j f_j$, then the function $\partial^4_{\vec{\varepsilon}} u_{\vec{\varepsilon}}|_{\vec{\varepsilon}=0}$ is not C^∞-smooth at y.*

Lemma 3.5. *Let $(\vec{x}, \vec{\xi})$, and $\mathbf{t}_j$ with $j = 1, 2, 3, 4$ and $t_0 > 0$ satisfy (44)-(45). Let $t_0 > 0$ be sufficiently small and assume that $y \in \mathcal{N}((\vec{x}, \vec{\xi}), t_0) \cap U$ satisfies $y \notin \mathcal{Y}((\vec{x}, \vec{\xi}); t_0, \widehat{s}) \cup \bigcup_{j=1}^4 \gamma_{x_j,\xi_j}(\mathbb{R})$. Then*

(i) If y does not satisfy condition (I) with $(\vec{x}, \vec{\xi})$ and t_0, then y does not satisfy condition (D) with $(\vec{x}, \vec{\xi})$ and $t_0 > 0$ and some $\widehat{s} > 0$.

(ii) Assume $y \in U$ satisfies condition (I) with $(\vec{x}, \vec{\xi})$ and t_0 and parameters q, ζ, and $0 < t < \rho(q, \zeta)$. Then y satisfies condition (D) with $(\vec{x}, \vec{\xi})$, t_0, and for any sufficiently small $\widehat{s} > 0$.

(iii) Using L_V we can determine whether the condition (D) is valid for the given point $y \in U$ with the parameters $(\vec{x}, \vec{\xi})$, $\widehat{s}$, and t_0.

Proof. (i) Assume that $y \in U$ does not satisfy condition (I). Let (x'_j, ξ'_j), B_j, and $f_j \in \mathcal{I}^{n+1}_C(Y(x'_j, \xi'_j; t_0, s_0))$ be as in condition (D). Moreover, let $u_{\vec{\varepsilon}}$ be the solution of (22) with $f_{\vec{\varepsilon}} = \sum_{j=1}^4 \varepsilon_j f_j$ and $\mathcal{U}^{(4)} = \partial^4_{\vec{\varepsilon}} u_{\vec{\varepsilon}}|_{\vec{\varepsilon}=0}$. When s and s_0 are small enough, Thm. 3.3 (i) implies that $\mathcal{U}^{(4)}$ is C^∞-smooth at y. Thus (D) is not valid.

(ii) Let $y \in U$ satisfy condition (I) with $(\vec{x}, \vec{\xi})$ and t_0 and parameters q, ζ, and $0 < t < \rho(q, \zeta)$. Also, let $x_5 = \gamma_{q,\zeta}(t) = y$ and $\xi_5 = \dot{\gamma}_{q,\zeta}(t)$. For $j = 1, 2, 3, 4$, let $t_j > 0$ be such that $\gamma_{x_j,\xi_j}(t_j) = q$ and $b^{(j)} = \dot{\gamma}_{x_j,\xi_j}(t_j) \in L^+_q M_0$. Then by Lemma 3.4, arbitrarily close to $b^{(j)}$, there are $\widetilde{b}^{(j)} \in L^+_q M_0$ and $\widetilde{v}^{(j)} \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\mathcal{G}_{\mathbf{g}}((\widetilde{b}^{(j)})_{j=1}^5, (\widetilde{v}^{(j)})_{j=1}^5) \neq 0$. Let $x'_j = \gamma_{q,\widetilde{b}^{(j)}}(-t_j)$ and $\xi'_j = \dot{\gamma}_{q,\widetilde{b}^{(j)}}(-t_j)$. Then we see that for all $s_0, s_1 > 0$ there are $f_j \in \mathcal{I}^{n+1}_C(Y(x'_j, \xi'_j; t_0, s_0))$ for which the principal symbol of Qf_j at $(q, \widetilde{b}^{(j)})$ is equal to $\widetilde{v}^{(j)}$, $j = 1, 2, 3, 4$ such that f_j are supported in the sets $B_j \subset B_{g^+}(\gamma_{x'_j,\xi'_j}(t_0), s)$ satisfying (82). Moreover, let $W \subset U$ be a neighborhood of y. Let F_τ be the source, supported in W, which produces a gaussian beam determined by the direction (x_5, ξ_5). By Thm. 3.3 (iii), the indicator function $\Theta^{(4)}_\tau = \langle F_\tau, \mathcal{U}^{(4)} \rangle_{L^2(U)}$ has the asymptotics $s_m \tau^{-m} + O(\tau^{-m-1})$ as $\tau \to \infty$, where $s_m \neq 0$. This implies by [56] or [17, Cor. 1.4] that $M^{(4)}$ is not C^∞-smooth in W. As W can be chosen to be an arbitrarily small neighborhood of y, we see that (D) is not valid.

(iii) The map L_U determines the above functions $\mathcal{U}^{(4)} = \partial_{\vec{\varepsilon}}^4 u_{\vec{\varepsilon}}|_{\vec{\varepsilon}=0}$ in U. This yields (iii). □

Remark 3.3. Let us consider the case when the manifold (M_0, g) has no cut points. Let $U' = U \cap (I^+(p^-) \cap I^-(p^+))$. Using Lemma 3.5 we see that the geodesics corresponding 4-tuples $(\vec{x}, \vec{\xi}) \in (L^+U')^4$ intersect at some point $q \in I^+(p^-) \cap I^-(p^+)$ if and only if condition (D) is valid for some point $y \in \widehat{\mu}((s_-, s_+))$. Thus, by Lemma 3.5 the pair $(U, g|_U)$ and the source-to-field map L_U determine all 4-tuples $(\vec{x}, \vec{\xi}) \in (L^+U')^4$ for which the corresponding geodesics intersect at some point $q \in I^+(p^-) \cap I^-(p^+)$. Moreover, for such 4-tuples $(\vec{x}, \vec{\xi})$ these data determine all points $y \in U$ that satisfy condition (I) with $(\vec{x}, \vec{\xi})$ and some t_0, that is, all points y in the earliest light observation set $\mathcal{E}_U(q)$. Thus by varying the 4-tuples $(\vec{x}, \vec{\xi})$ we can determine sets $\mathcal{E}_U(q)$ for all $q \in I^+(p^-) \cap I^-(p^+)$. Hence, in the case when the manifold (M_0, g) has no cut points we have already reduced the proof of Theorem 1.5 to proving Theorem 1.2.

4. Determination of the earliest light observation sets

In this section we reduce the proof of Theorem 1.5 to proving Theorem 1.2 that is given later in Section 5. As explained in Remark 3.3, we have already done this reduction in Section 3 in the case when the manifold (M, g) has no cut points. Next we consider the general case which leads to some technical considerations involving the cut points and light-like geodesics that may intersect several times.

Below, we assume that we are given $(U, g|_U)$ and the source-to-observation map L_U.

Remark 4.1. When the Lorentzian manifold $(U, g|_U)$ is given, and $\mathcal{W} \subset C_0^6(U)$ is a small neighborhood of the zero-function, the source-solution map $L_U : \mathcal{W} \to C(U)$, $L_U(f) = u|_U$, for the equation (7), determines the source-solution relation, that is, the set

$$\mathcal{D} = \{(f, u|_U) \ ; \ u \text{ satisfies (7) with } f \in \mathcal{W}\}, \tag{83}$$

that corresponds to the graph of the map L_U. Instead of assuming in Thm. 1.5 that we are given the pair of $((U, g|_U), L_U)$, we can assume that we are given $(U, g|_U)$ and $\mathcal{D}$.

4.1. Surfaces of the earliest singularities.

Next we consider the determination of the the earliest light observation sets $\mathcal{E}_U(q)$, see Def. 1.1. To this end we need the following notation:

Definition 4.1. *For a closed set $S \subset U$, we define the earliest points of set S on the curve $\mu_a = \mu_a([-1, 1])$ to be*

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbf{e}_a(S) = \{\mu_a(\inf\{s \in [-1, 1];\ \mu_a(s) \in S\})\}, \ \textit{if } \mu_a \cap S \neq \emptyset, \\ &\mathbf{e}_a(S) = \emptyset, \quad \textit{if } \mu_a \cap S = \emptyset. \end{aligned} \tag{84}$$

Note that by the above definition, $\mu_a(f_a^+(q)) = \mathbf{e}_a(\mathcal{P}_U(q))$.

Our next aim is to consider the global problem of constructing the set of the earliest light observations in U of all points $q \in J(p^-, p^+)$. To this end, we need to handle the technical problem that in the set $\mathcal{Y}((\vec{x}, \vec{\xi}))$ we have not analyzed if we observe singularities. Also, we have not analyzed the waves in the set $M_0 \setminus \mathcal{N}((\vec{x}, \vec{\xi}), t_0)$ where singularities caused by caustics or their interactions may appear, see (45). To avoid these difficulties, we define next the sets $\mathcal{S}_{reg}((\vec{x}, \vec{\xi}), t_0)$ of points near which we observe singularities in a 3-dimensional set.

Definition 4.2. *Let $(\vec{x}, \vec{\xi}) = ((x_j, \xi_j))_{j=1}^4$ be a collection of light-like vectors with $x_j \in U_g$ and $t_0 > 0$. We define $\mathcal{S}((\vec{x}, \vec{\xi}), t_0)$ be the set of those $y \in U_g$ that satisfies the property (D) with $(\vec{x}, \vec{\xi})$ and t_0 and some $\widehat{s} > 0$. Moreover, let $\mathcal{S}_{reg}((\vec{x}, \vec{\xi}), t_0)$ be the set of the points $y_0 \in \mathcal{S}((\vec{x}, \vec{\xi}), t_0)$ having a neighborhood $W \subset U_g$ such that the intersection $W \cap \mathcal{S}((\vec{x}, \vec{\xi}), t_0)$ is a non-empty C^∞-smooth 3-dimensional submanifold. We denote (see (84) and Def. 1.1)*

$$\mathcal{S}_{cl}(\vec{x}, \vec{\xi}), t_0) = cl\,(\mathcal{S}_{reg}((\vec{x}, \vec{\xi}), t_0)) \cap U_g, \tag{85}$$

$$\mathcal{S}_e((\vec{x}, \vec{\xi}), t_0) = \bigcup_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \mathbf{e}_a(\mathcal{S}_{cl}((\vec{x}, \vec{\xi}), t_0)). \tag{86}$$

We call $\mathcal{S}_e((\vec{x}, \vec{\xi}), t_0)$ the surface of the earliest singularities produced by the interaction of the four waves.

Lemma 3.5 and Def. 4.2 give immediately the following observation:

Lemma 4.3. *The manifold $(U, g|_U)$ and the data set $\mathcal{D}$, see (83), determine the set $\mathcal{S}_e((\vec{x}, \vec{\xi}), t_0)$ for all $(\vec{x}, \vec{\xi}) \in (L^+U)^4$ and $t_0 > 0$.*

Remark 4.2. By Lemma 4.3 the sets $\mathcal{S}_e((\vec{x}, \vec{\xi}), t_0)$ are determined by the measurement data. In the rest of this section we show that the sets $\mathcal{S}_e((\vec{x}, \vec{\xi}), t_0)$ determine the collection $\{\mathcal{E}_U(q);\ q \in I^+(p^-) \cap I^-(p^+)\}$ of the earliest light observation sets.

Below, we fix t_0 to be $t_0 = 4\kappa_1$, In this section, κ_1 and κ_2 are parameters appearing in Lemma 2.8.

We now show that if the geodesics emanating from $(\vec{x}, \vec{\xi})$ intersect before their first cut points at q_0 then $\mathcal{S}_e(\vec{x}, \vec{\xi}), t_0)$ coincides with the set $\mathcal{E}_U(q_0)$. To prove this we need to take care of the difficulties that we do not a priori know where the cut points (i.e. caustics of the waves) are located and that we have not analyzed the singularities produced by the 3-wave interactions supported near $\mathcal{Y}((\vec{x}, \vec{\xi}))$ nor the singularities produced by caustics that may appear in the set $M_0 \setminus \mathcal{N}((\vec{x}, \vec{\xi}), t_0)$.

If the set $\cap_{j=1}^4 \gamma_{x_j, \xi_j}([t_0, \infty))$ is non-empty we denote its earliest point by $Q((\vec{x}, \vec{\xi}), t_0)$. If such intersection point does not exists, we define

$Q((\vec{x},\vec{\xi}),t_0)$ to be the empty set. Next we consider the relation of $\mathcal{S}_e((\vec{x},\vec{\xi}),t_0)$ and $\mathcal{E}_U(q)$, $q=Q((\vec{x},\vec{\xi}),t_0)$, see Def. 1.1.

Lemma 4.4. *Let $(\vec{x},\vec{\xi})$, $j=1,2,3,4$ and $t_0>0$ satisfy (44)-(45) and assume that ϑ_1 in (44) and Lemma 2.8 is so small that for all $j\le 4$, $x_j\in I(\widehat{\mu}(s_1),\widehat{\mu}(s_2))\subset U_g$ with some $s_1,s_2\in(s_-,s_+)$.*

Let $\mathcal{N}=\mathcal{N}((\vec{x},\vec{\xi}),t_0)$ be the set defined in (45). Then

(i) Assume that $y\in\mathcal{N}\cap U_g$ satisfies the condition (I) with $(\vec{x},\vec{\xi})$ and t_0 and parameters q,ζ, and t such that $0\le t\le\rho(q,\zeta)$. Then $y\in\mathcal{S}_{cl}((\vec{x},\vec{\xi}),t_0)$.

(ii) Assume $y\in\mathcal{N}\cap U_g$ does not satisfy condition (I) with $(\vec{x},\vec{\xi})$ and t_0. Then $y\notin\mathcal{S}_{cl}((\vec{x},\vec{\xi}),t_0)$.

(iii) If $Q((\vec{x},\vec{\xi}),t_0)\neq\emptyset$ and $q=Q((\vec{x},\vec{\xi}),t_0)\in\mathcal{N}$, we have

$$\mathcal{S}_e((\vec{x},\vec{\xi}),t_0)=\mathcal{E}_U(q)\subset\mathcal{N}.$$

Otherwise, if $Q((\vec{x},\vec{\xi}),t_0)\cap\mathcal{N}=\emptyset$, then $\mathcal{S}_e((\vec{x},\vec{\xi}),t_0)\cap\mathcal{N}=\emptyset$.

Proof. (i) Assume first that y is not in $\mathcal{Y}((\vec{x},\vec{\xi}))$ and $t<\rho(q,\zeta)$. Then the assumptions in (i) and Lemma 3.5 imply that $y\in\mathcal{S}_{cl}((\vec{x},\vec{\xi}),t_0)$. Consider next a general point y satisfying the assumptions in (i) and let $q=Q((\vec{x},\vec{\xi}),t_0)$. Then $y\in\mathcal{E}_U(q)$. Recall that $\rho(x,\xi)$ is lower semi-continuous. Since the set $\mathcal{E}_U(q)\setminus\mathcal{Y}((\vec{x},\vec{\xi}))$ is dense in $\mathcal{E}_U(q)$, we have that y is a limit point of points $y_n\notin\mathcal{Y}((\vec{x},\vec{\xi}))$ that satisfy the assumptions in (i). These yield that $y\in\mathcal{S}_{cl}((\vec{x},\vec{\xi}),t_0)$.

Therefore, the claim (ii) follows from Lemma 3.5.

(iii) Suppose $q=Q((\vec{x},\vec{\xi}),t_0)\in\mathcal{N}$ and $y\in\mathcal{E}_U(q)\setminus\bigcup_{j=1}^4\gamma_{x_j,\xi_j}([t_0,\infty))$. Let $\gamma_{q,\eta}([0,l])$ be a light-like geodesic that is the longest causal geodesic from q to y with $l\le\rho(q,\eta)$, and let $p_j=\gamma_{x_j,\xi_j}(t_0+\mathbf{t}_j)$, $\mathbf{t}_j=\rho(x_j(t_0),\xi_j(t_0))$, be the first cut point on the geodesic $\gamma_{x_j,\xi_j}([t_0,\infty))$. To show that y is in $\mathcal{N}$, we assume the opposite, $y\notin\mathcal{N}$. Then for some j there is a causal geodesic $\gamma_{p_j,\theta_j}([0,l_j])$ from p_j to y. Now we can use a short-cut argument: Let $q=\gamma_{x_j,\xi_j}(t')$. As $q\in\mathcal{N}$, we have $t'<t_0+\mathbf{t}_j$. Moreover, as $y\notin\gamma_{x_j,\xi_j}([t_0,\infty))$, the union of the geodesic $\gamma_{x_j,\xi_j}([t',t_0+\mathbf{t}_j])$ from q to p_j and $\gamma_{p_j,\theta_j}([0,l_j])$ from p_j to y does not form a light-like geodesic and thus $\tau(q,y)>0$. As $y\in\mathcal{E}_U(q)$, this is not possible. Hence $y\in\mathcal{N}$. Thus by (i), $y\in\mathcal{S}_{cl}((\vec{x},\vec{\xi}),t_0)$ and hence $\mathcal{E}_U(q)\setminus(\bigcup_{j=1}^4\gamma_{x_j,\xi_j}([t_0,\infty)))\subset\mathcal{S}_{cl}((\vec{x},\vec{\xi}),t_0)$. Since the set $\mathcal{E}_U(q)\setminus(\bigcup_{j=1}^4\gamma_{x_j,\xi_j}([t_0,\infty)))$ is dense in the closed set $\mathcal{E}_U(q)$, the above shows that $\mathcal{E}_U(q)\subset\mathcal{S}_{cl}((\vec{x},\vec{\xi}),t_0)$. Also by (ii), $\mathcal{S}_{cl}((\vec{x},\vec{\xi}),t_0)\subset{}^+(q)$. Using Definition 1.1 and (86), we see that $\mathcal{S}_e((\vec{x},\vec{\xi}),t_0)=\mathcal{E}_U(q)$.

On the other hand, if $Q((\vec{x},\vec{\xi}),t_0)\cap\mathcal{N}=\emptyset$, we can apply (ii) for all $y\in\mathcal{N}\cap U$ and see that $\mathcal{S}_{cl}((\vec{x},\vec{\xi}),t_0)\cap\mathcal{N}=\emptyset$. This proves (iii). □

Next we consider the set $\mathcal{K}_{t_0}$ that is the closure of a small neighborhood of $\widehat{\mu}$. As we consider wave propagating near geodesics $\gamma_{\widehat{x},\widehat{\zeta}}([t_0,\infty))$ where $\widehat{x}\in\widehat{\mu}$, we have to consider the earliest light observation sets corresponding to the points $\gamma_{\widehat{x},\widehat{\zeta}}([0,t_0))$ separately. This is why the set $\mathcal{K}_{t_0}$ is introduced.

4.2. **Step-by-step construction of the spacetime.** Let

$$\begin{aligned}(87)\qquad \mathcal{K}_{t_0}=\{x\in U\ \ ;\ \ & x=\gamma_{\widehat{x},\xi}(r),\ \widehat{x}=\widehat{\mu}(s),\ s\in[s^-,s^+],\\ & \xi\in L^+_{\widehat{x}}M_0,\ \|\xi\|_{g^+}=1,\ r\in[0,2t_0)\}.\end{aligned}$$

Recall that by (13) the set $R_U=\{(x,y)\in U\times U;\ x\ll y\}$ is assumed to be known. This set determines the sets $\mathcal{E}_U(\mathcal{K}_{t_0}\cap J^+(\widehat{\mu}(s)))$ for all $s\in[s_-,s_+]$. Here, recall that for a set $W\subset M$, we denote $\mathcal{E}_U(W)=\{\mathcal{E}_U(q);\ q\in W\}\subset 2^U$. Also, we may assume below that ϑ_1 is so small that $\gamma_{y,\zeta}([0,t_0])\cap J(p^-,p^+)\subset\mathcal{K}_{t_0}$ when $y\in J(p^-,p^+)$, $d_{g^+}(y,\widehat{\mu})<\vartheta_1$ and $\zeta\in L^+_yM$, $\|\zeta\|_{g^+}\le 1+\vartheta_1$.

Let $s_0\in[s_-,s_+]$ be so close to s_+ that $J^+(\widehat{\mu}(s_0))\cap J^-(p^+)\subset\mathcal{K}_{t_0}$. Then the given data $\mathcal{D}$ and the manifold $(U,g|_U)$ determine $\mathcal{E}_U(J^+(\widehat{\mu}(s_0))\cap J^-(p^+))$.



FIGURE 7. The blue points on $\widehat{\mu}$ are $\widehat{x}_1=\widehat{\mu}(s_1)$, $\widehat{x}_2=\widehat{\mu}(s_2)$, and $\widehat{x}=\widehat{\mu}(s)$. The blue points y and y' are close to $\widehat{x}$. The boundary of $J^+(\widehat{x}_1)$ is marked by black. We consider the geodesics $\gamma_{y,\zeta}([0,\infty))$ and $\gamma_{y',\zeta'}([0,\infty))$. These geodesics corresponding to the cases when the geodesic $\gamma_{y,\zeta}([0,\infty))$ enters in $J^-(p^+)\cap J^+(\widehat{x}_1)$, and the case when the geodesic $\gamma_{y',\zeta'}([0,\infty))$ does not enter this set. The point p_0 is the cut point of $\gamma_{y,\zeta}([t_0,\infty))$ and p_0' is the cut point of $\gamma_{y',\zeta'}([t_0,\infty))$. At the point $z=\widehat{\mu}(\mathbb{S}(y,\zeta,s_1))$ we observe for the first time on the geodesic $\widehat{\mu}$ that the geodesic $\gamma_{y,\zeta}([0,\infty))$ has entered $J^+(\widehat{x}_1)$. The entering in the set $J^+(\widehat{x}_1)$ happens at the point p.

Next we use a step-by-step construction: We consider $s_1\in(s_-,s_+)$ and assume that we are given $\mathcal{E}_U(J^+(\widehat{x}_1)\cap J^-(p^+))$ with $\widehat{x}_1=\widehat{\mu}(s_1)$. Then, let $s_2\in(s_1-\kappa_2,s_1)$. Our next aim is to find the earliest light observation sets $\mathcal{E}_U(J^+(\widehat{x}_2)\cap J^-(p^+))$ with $\widehat{x}_2=\widehat{\mu}(s_2)$.

4.2.1. *Determination of the time when a geodesic is observed to enter in to the already reconstructed set.* Let us describe the rough idea of the construction that we do next: We will consider the point $p = \gamma_{y,\zeta}(r)$ where a geodesic $\gamma_{y,\zeta}$ first time enters (see Fig. 7) in the "already reconstructed" set $J^+(\widehat{x}_1) \cap J^-(p^+)$ or exits the set $J^-(p^+)$. In particular we consider the time $s = \mathbb{S}(y, \zeta, s_1)$ where the light coming from the point p is first time observed on $\widehat{\mu}$. The time $\mathbb{S}(y, \zeta, s_1)$ will be essential for us as we can make sure that we do not record on $\widehat{\mu}$ any strange signals that caustics may have produced before this time. The idea is that when $r' > r$ is close to r, the observations from an artificial point sources produced at the point $\gamma_{y,\zeta}(r')$ coincide with the observations that we have made earlier. These earlier made observations are called below the genuine observations. We will later construct the time $\mathbb{S}(y, \zeta, s_1)$ from our given measurements using the time when we first record a genuine observation on $\widehat{\mu}$. Next we present details of this construction.

We recall the notation that $\widehat{\mu} = \mu_{\widehat{a}}$.

Definition 4.5. *Let $s_- \le s_2 \le s < s_1 \le s_+$ satisfy $s_1 < s_2 + \kappa_2$, $\widehat{x}_j = \widehat{\mu}(s_j)$, $j = 1, 2$, and $\widehat{x} = \widehat{\mu}(s)$, $\widehat{\zeta} \in L^+_{\widehat{x}}U$, $\|\widehat{\zeta}\|_{g^+} = 1$. Let $(y, \zeta) \in L^+U$ be in ϑ_1-neighborhood of $(\widehat{x}, \widehat{\zeta})$ such that $y \in J^+(\widehat{x}_2)$ and the geodesic $\gamma_{y,\zeta}(\mathbb{R}_+)$ does not intersect $\widehat{\mu}$. Define*

$$\begin{aligned} r_1(y, \zeta, s_1) &= \inf\{r > 0;\ \gamma_{y,\zeta}(r) \in J^+(\widehat{\mu}(s_1))\}, \\ r_2(y, \zeta) &= \inf\{r > 0;\ \gamma_{y,\zeta}(r) \in M \setminus I^-(\widehat{\mu}(s_{+2}))\}, \\ r_0(y, \zeta, s_1) &= \min(r_2(y, \zeta), r_1(y, \zeta, s_1)). \end{aligned}$$

When $\gamma_{y,\zeta}(\mathbb{R}_+)$ intersects $J^+(\widehat{\mu}(s_1)) \cap J^-(p^+)$ we define

$$\mathbb{S}(y, \zeta, s_1) = f^+_{\widehat{a}}(q_0), \tag{88}$$

where $q_0 = \gamma_{y,\zeta}(r_0)$ and $r_0 = r_0(y, \zeta, s_1)$. In the case when $\gamma_{y,\zeta}(\mathbb{R}_+)$ does not intersect $J^+(\widehat{\mu}(s_1)) \cap J^-(p^+)$, we define $\mathbb{S}(y, \zeta, s_1) = s^+$.

We note that above $r_2(y, \zeta)$ is finite by [63, Lem. 14.13]. Below we use the notations used in Def. 4.5. We saw earlier in Section 3.5 that using the source-to-field map L_U and the solutions of the linearized wave equation we can find $\gamma_{x,\xi} \cap U_g$ for any $(x, \xi) \in L^+U$. Thus we can check for given (x, ξ) if $\gamma_{x,\xi} \cap \widehat{\mu} = \emptyset$.

Definition 4.6. *Let $0 < \vartheta < \vartheta_1$ and $\mathcal{R}_\vartheta(y, \zeta)$ be the set of $(\vec{x}, \vec{\xi}) = ((x_j, \xi_j))_{j=1}^4$ that satisfy (i) and (ii) in formula (44) with ϑ_1 replaced by ϑ and $(x_1, \xi_1) = (y, \zeta)$. We say that the set $S \subset U_g$ is a genuine observation associated to the geodesic $\gamma_{y,\zeta}$ if there is $\widehat{\vartheta} > 0$ such that for all $\vartheta \in (0, \widehat{\vartheta})$ there are $(\vec{x}, \vec{\xi}) \in \mathcal{R}_\vartheta(y, \zeta)$ such that $S = \mathcal{S}_e((\vec{x}, \vec{\xi}), t_0)$.*

Lemma 4.7. *Assume that $\max(s_-, s_1 - \kappa_2) \le s < s_1 < s^+$ and let $\widehat{x} = \widehat{\mu}(s)$, $\widehat{x}_1 = \widehat{\mu}(s_1)$, and $\widehat{\zeta} \in L^+_{\widehat{x}}M$, $\|\widehat{\zeta}\|_{g^+} = 1$. Moreover, let*

(y,ζ) be in a ϑ_1-neighborhood of $(\widehat{x},\widehat{\zeta})$. Assume also that the geodesic $\gamma_{y,\zeta}(\mathbb{R}_+)$ does not intersect $\widehat{\mu}$.
(A) Then the cut point $p_0=\gamma_{y(t_0),\zeta(t_0)}(\mathbf{t}_*)$, $\mathbf{t}_*=\rho(y(t_0),\zeta(t_0))$ of the geodesics $\gamma_{y(t_0),\zeta(t_0)}([0,\infty))$, if it exists, satisfies either

(i) $p_0\notin J^-(\widehat{\mu}(s_{+2}))$,

or

(ii) $r_0=r_0(y,\zeta,s_1)<r_2(y,\zeta)$ and $p_0\in I^+(\widehat{x}_1)$.

(B) There is $\vartheta_2(y,\zeta,s_1)\in(0,\vartheta_1)$ such that if $0<\vartheta<\vartheta_2(y,\zeta,s_1)$, $(\vec{x},\vec{\xi})\in\mathcal{R}_\vartheta(y,\zeta)$, and the geodesics $\gamma_{x_j(t_0),\xi_j(t_0)}([0,\infty))$, $j\in\{1,2,3,4\}$, has a cut point $p_j=\gamma_{x_j(t_0),\xi_j(t_0)}(\mathbf{t}_j)$, then the following holds:

If either the point p_0 does not exist or it exists and (i) holds then $p_j\notin J^-(p^+)$. On the other hand, if p_0 exists and (ii) holds, then $f_{\widehat{a}}^+(p_j)>f_{\widehat{a}}^+(q_0)$, where $q_0=\gamma_{y,\zeta}(r_0(y,\zeta,s_1))$.

Note that $f_{\widehat{a}}^+(q_0)=\mathbb{S}(y,\zeta,s_1)$.

Proof. (A) Assume that (i) does not hold, that is, $p_0=\gamma_{y,\zeta}(t_0+\mathbf{t}_*)\in J^-(\widehat{\mu}(s_{+2}))$. By Lemma 2.8 (iii) we have $f_{\widehat{a}}^-(p_0)>s+2\kappa_2\geq s_1$ that yields $p_0\in I^+(\widehat{x}_1)$. Thus, the geodesic $\gamma_{y(t_0),\zeta(t_0)}([0,\rho(y(t_0),\zeta(t_0)))$ intersects $J^+(\widehat{x}_1)\cap J^-(\widehat{\mu}(s_{+2}))$. Hence the alternative (ii) holds with $0<r_0<r_2(y,\zeta)$ and moreover, $r_0<t_0+\rho(y(t_0),\zeta(t_0))$.

(B) If (i) holds, the claim follows since the function $(x,\xi)\mapsto\rho(x,\xi)$ is lower semi-continuous and $(x,\xi,t)\mapsto\gamma_{x,\xi}(t)$ is continuous.

In the case (ii), we saw above that $r_0<t_0+\rho(y(t_0),\zeta(t_0))$. Let $q_0=\gamma_{y,\zeta}(r_0)$. Then by using a short cut argument and the fact that $\gamma_{y,\zeta}(\mathbb{R}_+)$ does not intersect $\widehat{\mu}$ we see similarly to the above that $f_{\widehat{a}}^+(p_0)>f_{\widehat{a}}^+(q_0)=\mathbb{S}(y,\zeta,s_1)$. Since the function $(x,\xi,t)\mapsto f_{\widehat{a}}^+(\gamma_{x,\xi}(t))$ is continuous and $t\mapsto f_{\widehat{a}}^+(\gamma_{x,\xi}(t))$ is non-decreasing, and the function $(x,\xi)\mapsto\rho(x,\xi)$ is lower semi-continuous, we have that the function $(x,\xi)\mapsto f_{\widehat{a}}^+(\gamma_{x(t_0),\xi(t_0)}(\rho(x(t_0),\xi(t_0))))$ is lower semi-continuous, and the claim follows. □

We recall that below we assume that the set $\mathcal{E}_U(J^+(\widehat{x}_1)\cap J^-(p^+))$ is already constructed.

Definition 4.8. *Let $s_-\leq s_2\leq s<s_1\leq s_+$ satisfy $s_1<s_2+\kappa_2$, $\widehat{x}_j=\widehat{\mu}(s_j)$, $j=1,2$, and $\widehat{x}=\widehat{\mu}(s)$, $\widehat{\zeta}\in L^+_{\widehat{x}}U$, $\|\widehat{\zeta}\|_{g^+}=1$. Also, let $(y,\zeta)\in L^+U$ be in ϑ_1-neighborhood of $(\widehat{x},\widehat{\zeta})$ and $\mathcal{G}(y,\zeta,s_1)$ be the set of the genuine observations $S\subset U_g$ associated to the geodesic $\gamma_{y,\zeta}$ such that $S\in\mathcal{E}_U(J^+(\widehat{x}_1)\cap J^-(p^+))$. Moreover, define $\mathbb{S}^{obs}(y,\zeta,s_1)$ to be the infimum of $s'\in[-1,s_+]$ such that $\widehat{\mu}(s')\in S\cap\widehat{\mu}$ with some $S\in\mathcal{G}(y,\zeta,s_1)$. If no such s' exists, we define $\mathbb{S}^{obs}(y,\zeta,s_1)=s^+$.*

Let us next consider $(\vec{x},\vec{\xi})\in\mathcal{R}_\vartheta(y,\zeta)$ where $0<\vartheta<\vartheta_2(y,\zeta,s_1)$. Here, $\vartheta_2(y,\zeta,s_1)$ is defined in Lemma 4.7. Assume that for some $j=1,2,3,4$ we have that $\rho(x_j(t_0),\xi_j(t_0))<\mathcal{T}(x_j(t_0),\xi_j(t_0))$ and consider the cut point $p_j=\gamma_{x_j(t_0),\xi_j(t_0)}(\rho(x_j(t_0),\xi_j(t_0)))$. Then either the case (i)

or (ii) of Lemma 4.7 holds. If (i) holds, by Lemma 4.7 (B), p_j satisfies $p_j \notin J^-(p^+)$ and thus $f^+_{\widehat{a}}(p_j) > s_+ \geq \mathbb{S}(y,\zeta,s_1)$. If (ii) holds, there exists $r_0 = r_0(y,\zeta,s_1) < r_1(y,\zeta)$ such that $q_0 = \gamma_{y,\zeta}(r_0) \in J^+(\widehat{x}_1)$ and $f^+_{\widehat{a}}(p_j) > f^+_{\widehat{a}}(q_0) = \mathbb{S}(y,\zeta,s_1)$. Thus both in case (i) and (ii) we have

$$f^+_{\widehat{a}}(p_j) > \mathbb{S}(y,\zeta,s_1). \tag{89}$$

We consider next a point $q = \gamma_{y,\zeta}(r) \in J^-(p^+)$, where $t_0 < r \leq r_0 = r_0(y,\zeta,s_1)$. Let $\theta = -\dot\gamma_{y,\zeta}(r) \in T_qM$. By Lemma 2.8 (iii), the geodesic $\gamma_{y,\zeta}([t_0,r]) = \gamma_{q,\theta}([0,r-t_0])$ has no cut points. Denote $\widetilde{x} = \widehat{\mu}(\mathbb{S}(y,\zeta,s_1))$. Note that then $q \in J^-(\widetilde{x})$. Then, consider four geodesics that emanate from q to the past, in the light-like direction $\eta_1 = \theta$ and in the light-like directions $\eta_j \in T_qM$, $j = 2,3,4$ that are sufficiently close to the direction θ. Let $\gamma_{q,\eta_j}(r_j)$ be the intersection points of γ_{q,η_j} with the surface $\{x \in M;\ \mathbf{t}(x) = c_0\}$, on which the time function $\mathbf{t}(x)$ has the constant value $c_0 := \mathbf{t}(\gamma_{y,\zeta}(t_0))$. Note that such $r_j = r_j(\eta_j)$ exists by the inverse function theorem when η_j is sufficiently close to η_1. Choosing $x_j = \gamma_{q,\eta_j}(r_j + t_0)$ and $\xi_j = -\dot\gamma_{q,\eta_j}(r_j + t_0)$ we have that when $\vartheta_3 \in (0, \vartheta_2(y,\zeta,s_1))$ is small enough, for all $\vartheta \in (0,\vartheta_3)$, there is $(\vec{x},\vec{\xi}) = ((x_j,\xi_j))_{j=1}^4 \in \mathcal{R}_\vartheta(y,\zeta)$ such that the geodesics corresponding to $(\vec{x},\vec{\xi})$ intersect at q. As the set (U_g, g) is known, that for sufficiently small ϑ one can verify if given vectors $(\vec{x},\vec{\xi})$ satisfy $(\vec{x},\vec{\xi}) = ((x_j,\xi_j))_{j=1}^4 \in \mathcal{R}_\vartheta(y,\zeta)$, cf. [63, Prop. 5.7]. Also, note that as then $\vartheta < \vartheta_2(y,\zeta,s_1)$, the inequality (89) yields $\widetilde{x} \in \mathcal{N}((\vec{x},\vec{\xi}),t_0)$ and thus $q \in J^-(\widetilde{x}) \subset \mathcal{N}((\vec{x},\vec{\xi}),t_0)$. Then Lemma 4.4 (iii) gives that $\mathcal{S}_e((\vec{x},\vec{\xi}),t_0) = \mathcal{E}_U(q)$. As $\vartheta \in (0,\vartheta_3)$ above can be arbitrarily small, we have that for any $q = \gamma_{y,\zeta}(r) \in J^-(p^+)$ where $t_0 < r \leq r_0 = r_0(y,\zeta,s_1)$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &S = \mathcal{E}_U(q) \text{ is a genuine observation associated to } \gamma_{y,\zeta} \text{ and} \\ &S \cap \widehat{\mu} = \{\widehat{\mu}(\widehat{s})\},\ \widehat{s} := f^+_{\widehat{a}}(q) \leq \mathbb{S}(y,\zeta,s_1). \end{aligned} \tag{90}$$

Lemma 4.9. *Assume that $\gamma_{y,\zeta}(\mathbb{R}_+)$ does not intersect $\widehat{\mu}$. Then we have $\mathbb{S}^{obs}(y,\zeta,s_1) = \mathbb{S}(y,\zeta,s_1)$.*

Proof. Let us first prove that $\mathbb{S}^{obs}(y,\zeta,s_1) \geq \mathbb{S}(y,\zeta,s_1)$. To this end, let $s' < \mathbb{S}(y,\zeta,s_1)$ and $x' = \widehat{\mu}(s')$. Assume $S \in \mathcal{E}_U(J^+(\widehat{x}_1) \cap J^-(p^+))$ is a genuine observation associated to the geodesic $\gamma_{y,\zeta}$ and $S \cap \widehat{\mu} = \{\widehat{\mu}(s')\}$. Let $q \in J^+(\widehat{x}_1) \cap J^-(p^+)$ be such that $S = \mathcal{E}_U(q)$.

Then for arbitrarily small $0 < \vartheta < \vartheta_2(y,\zeta,s_1)$ there is $(\vec{x},\vec{\xi}) \in \mathcal{R}_\vartheta(y,\zeta)$ satisfying $\mathcal{S}_e((\vec{x},\vec{\xi}),t_0) = S$. Let $\mathcal{N} = \mathcal{N}((\vec{x},\vec{\xi}),t_0)$. Then by (89), we have $x' \in \mathcal{N}$.

If the geodesics corresponding to $(\vec{x},\vec{\xi})$ intersect at some point $q' \in J^-(x')$, then by Lemma 4.4 (i), (ii) we have $S = \mathcal{E}_U(q')$. Recall that $\widehat{\mu} = \mu_{\widehat{a}}$. Then $\widehat{\mu}(s') = \widehat{\mu}(f^+_{\widehat{a}}(q'))$ implying $f^+_{\widehat{a}}(q') = s'$. Moreover, we have then that $\mathcal{E}_U(q) = \mathcal{E}_U(q')$ and Proposition 2.2 yields $q' =$

q. Since $(\vec{x},\vec{\xi}) \in \mathcal{R}_\vartheta(y,\zeta)$ implies $(x_1,\xi_1)=(y,\zeta)$, we see that $q' \in \gamma_{y,\zeta}([t_0,\infty))$. As $q \in J^+(\widehat{x}_1)$, we have that $q = q' \in \gamma_{y,\zeta}([t_0,\infty)) \cap J^+(\widehat{x}_1) = \gamma_{y,\zeta}([r_0(y,\zeta,s_1),\infty))$. However, then $f^+_{\widehat{a}}(q') \geq \mathbb{S}(y,\zeta,s_1) > s'$ and thus $S \cap \widehat{\mu} = \mathcal{E}_U(q) \cap \widehat{\mu}$ can not be equal to $\{\widehat{\mu}(s')\}$.

On the other hand, if the geodesics corresponding to $(\vec{x},\vec{\xi})$ do not intersect at any point in $J^-(x') \subset \mathcal{N}$, then either they intersect in some $q'_1 \in (M \setminus J^-(x')) \cap \mathcal{N}$, do not intersect at all, or intersect at $q'_2 \in M \setminus \mathcal{N}$. In the first case, $S = \mathcal{E}_U(q'_1)$ do not satisfy $S \cap \widehat{\mu} \in \widehat{\mu}((-1,s'))$. In the other cases, Lemma 4.4 (iii) yields $\mathcal{S}_e((\vec{x},\vec{\xi}),t_0) \cap \mathcal{N} = \emptyset$. As $x' = \widehat{\mu}(s') \in \mathcal{N}$, we see that $S \cap \widehat{\mu}$ can not be equal to $\{\widehat{\mu}(s')\}$. Since above $s' < \mathbb{S}(y,\zeta,s_1)$ is arbitrary, this shows that $\mathbb{S}^{obs}(y,\zeta,s_1) \geq \mathbb{S}(y,\zeta,s_1)$.

Let us next show that $\mathbb{S}^{obs}(y,\zeta,s_1) \leq \mathbb{S}(y,\zeta,s_1)$. Assume the opposite. Then, if $\mathbb{S}(y,\zeta,s_1) = s_+$, we see by Def. 4.8 that $\mathbb{S}^{obs}(y,\zeta,s_1) = \mathbb{S}(y,\zeta,s_1)$ which leads to a contradiction. However, if $\mathbb{S}(y,\zeta,s_1) < s_+$, by Def. 4.5, we have (89). This implies the existence of $q_0 = \gamma_{y,\zeta}(r_0)$, $r_0 = r_0(y,\zeta,s_1)$ such that $q_0 \in J^+(\widehat{x}_1) \cap J^-(p^+)$ and by (90), $S = \mathcal{E}_U(q_0)$ is a genuine observation associated to the geodesic $\gamma_{y,\zeta}$. By Lemma 4.7 (ii), $\mathbb{S}(y,\zeta,s_1) = f^-_{\widehat{a}}(q_0)$ which implies, by Def. 4.8 that $\mathbb{S}^{obs}(y,\zeta,s_1) \leq \mathbb{S}(y,\zeta,s_1)$. Thus, $\mathbb{S}^{obs}(y,\zeta,s_1) = \mathbb{S}(y,\zeta,s_1)$. □

The above means that the function $\mathbb{S}(y,\zeta,s_1) = \mathbb{S}^{obs}(y,\zeta,s_1)$ can be reconstructed from the measurement data. Roughly speaking, this implies that all observations of singularities produced by the interaction of the 4 waves on $\gamma_{y,\zeta}([t_0,\infty))$ are those singularities that are produced by an artificial point sources.

4.2.2. *Construction of the collection of the earliest light observation sets.* Next we will collect all such observations together and reconstruct $\mathcal{E}_U(q)$ when q runs over a geodesic segment.

Lemma 4.10. *Let $s_- \leq s_2 \leq s < s_1 \leq s_+$ with $s_1 < s_2 + \kappa_2$, let $\widehat{x}_j = \widehat{\mu}(s_j)$, $j=1,2$, and $\widehat{x} = \widehat{\mu}(s)$, $\widehat{\zeta} \in L^+_{\widehat{x}}U$, $\|\widehat{\zeta}\|_{g^+} = 1$. Let $(y,\zeta) \in L^+U$ be in the ϑ_1-neighborhood of $(\widehat{x},\widehat{\zeta})$ such that $y \in J^+(\widehat{x}_2)$. Assume that $\gamma_{y,\zeta}(\mathbb{R}_+)$ does not intersect $\widehat{\mu}$. Then, if we are given the manifold $(U_g, g|_{U_g})$,the data set $\mathcal{D}$, and $\mathcal{E}_U(J^+(\widehat{x}_1) \cap J^-(p^+))$, we can determine the collection $\{\mathcal{E}_U(q);\ q \in G_0(y,\zeta,s_1)\}$, where $G_0(y,\zeta,s_1) = \{q \in \gamma_{y,\zeta}([t_0,\infty)) \cap (I^-(p^+) \setminus J^+(\widehat{x}_1))\}$.*

Proof. Let $s' = \mathbb{S}(y,\zeta,s_1)$, $x' = \widehat{\mu}(s')$, and Σ be the set of all genuine observations S associated to the geodesic $\gamma_{y,\zeta}$ such that S intersects $\widehat{\mu}([-1,s'))$.

Let $q = \gamma_{y,\zeta}(r) \in G_0(y,\zeta,s_1)$. Since $\gamma_{y,\zeta}(\mathbb{R}_+)$ does not intersect $\widehat{\mu}$, using a short cut argument for the geodesics from q to $q_0 = \gamma_{y,\zeta}(r_0(y,\zeta,s_1))$ and from q_0 to x', we see that $f^-_{\widehat{a}}(q) < s'$. Then, $q \in I^-(p^+) \setminus J^+(\widehat{x}_1)$ and $r < r_0(y,\zeta,s_1)$, and we have using (90) that $S = \mathcal{E}_U(q)$ is a genuine observation associated to the geodesic $\gamma_{y,\zeta}$ and $S \cap \widehat{\mu} = \{\widehat{\mu}(f^-_{\widehat{a}}(q))\}$ with $f^-_{\widehat{a}}(q) < s'$. Thus $\mathcal{E}_U(q) \in \Sigma$ and we conclude that $\mathcal{E}_U(G_0(y,\zeta,s_1)) \subset \Sigma$.

Next, suppose $S \in \Sigma$. Then there is $\widehat{\vartheta} \in (0, \vartheta_2(y,\zeta,s_1))$ such that for all $\vartheta \in (0,\widehat{\vartheta})$ there is $(\vec{x},\vec{\xi}) \in \mathcal{R}_\vartheta(y,\zeta)$ so that $\mathcal{S}_e((\vec{x},\vec{\xi}),t_0) = S$. Observe that by (89) we have $\widehat{\mu}([-1,s')) \subset J^-(x') \subset \mathcal{N}((\vec{x},\vec{\xi}),t_0)$.

First, consider the case when the geodesics corresponding to $(\vec{x},\vec{\xi})$ do not intersect at any point in $I^-(x')$. Then Lemma 4.4 (iii) yields that $\mathcal{S}_e((\vec{x},\vec{\xi}),t_0)$ is either empty or does not intersect $I^-(x')$. Thus $S \cap I^-(x') = \mathcal{S}_e((\vec{x},\vec{\xi}),t_0) \cap I^-(x')$ is empty and S does not intersect $\widehat{\mu}([-1,s'))$. Hence S cannot be in Σ.

Second, consider the case when the geodesics corresponding to $(\vec{x},\vec{\xi})$ intersect at some point $q \in I^-(x')$. Then, Lemma 4.4 (iii) yields $S = \mathcal{E}_U(q)$. Since $(\vec{x},\vec{\xi}) \in \mathcal{R}_\vartheta(y,\zeta)$ implies $(x_1,\xi_1) = (y,\zeta)$, the intersection point q has a representation $q = \gamma_{x_1,\xi_1}(r)$. As $q \in I^-(x')$, this yields $q \in G_0(y,\zeta,s_1)$ and $S \in \mathcal{E}_U(G_0(y,\zeta,s_1))$. Hence $\Sigma \subset \mathcal{E}_U(G_0(y,\zeta,s_1))$.

Combining the above arguments, we see that $\Sigma = \mathcal{E}_U(G_0(y,\zeta,s_1))$. As Σ is determined by the data set, the claim follows. □

Proposition 4.11. *Assume that the assumptions of Theorem 1.5 are valid and let $U_j \subset M_j$ be the smaller observation neighborhood defined by (11). Then there is an isometric diffeomorphism $\Phi : U_1 \to U_2$ such that $\Phi(\widehat{\mu}_1(s)) = \widehat{\mu}_2(s)$, $s \in [-1,1]$ and the power set extension $\widetilde{\Phi}$ of Φ satisfies*

$$\widetilde{\Phi}(\mathcal{E}_{U_1}(W_1)) = \mathcal{E}_{U_2}(W_2).$$

Proof. The proof is of constructive nature so we do the construction on one manifold (M,g). Let $B(s_2,s_1)$ be the set of all (y,ζ,t) such that there are $\widehat{x} = \widehat{\mu}(s)$, $s \in [s_2,s_1)$, $\widehat{x}_j = \widehat{\mu}(s_j)$, $j = 1,2$, and $\widehat{\zeta} \in L^+_{\widehat{x}}U$, $\|\widehat{\zeta}\|_{g^+} = 1$ so that $(y,\zeta) \in L^+U$ in ϑ_1-neighborhood of $(\widehat{x},\widehat{\zeta})$, $y \in J^+(\widehat{x}_2)$, and $t \in [t_0, r_0(y,\zeta,s_1)]$. Moreover, let $B_0(s_2,s_1)$ be the set of all $(y,\zeta,t) \in B(s_2,s_1)$ such that $t < r_0(y,\zeta,s_1)$ and $\gamma_{y,\zeta}(\mathbb{R}_+) \cap \widehat{\mu} = \emptyset$. Lemma 4.10 and the fact that the data set $\mathcal{D}$ and the manifold $(U_g, g|_{U_g})$ determine $\gamma_{y,\zeta} \cap U_g$ show that, when we are given the data set $\mathcal{D}$ and $(U, g|_U)$, we can determine the collection $\Sigma_0(s_2,s_1) := \{\mathcal{E}_U(q);\ q = \gamma_{y,\zeta}(t),\ (y,\zeta,t) \in B_0(s_2,s_1)\}$. We denote also $\Sigma(s_2,s_1) := \{\mathcal{E}_U(q);\ q = \gamma_{y,\zeta}(t),\ (y,\zeta,t) \in B(s_2,s_1)\}$.

Note that the sets $\mathcal{E}_U(q) \subset U$, where $q \in J := J^-(p^+) \cap J^+(p^-)$, can be identified with the continuous function, $F_q : \overline{\mathcal{A}} \to \mathbb{R}$, $F_q(a) = f^+_a(q)$, c.f. (12). When we endow the set $C(\overline{\mathcal{A}})$ of continuous maps $\overline{\mathcal{A}} \to \mathbb{R}$ with the topology of uniform convergence, Lemma 2.3 yields that $F : q \mapsto F_q$ is continuous map $F : J \to C(\overline{\mathcal{A}})$. By Proposition 2.2, F is one-to-one, and since J is compact and $C(\overline{\mathcal{A}})$ is Hausdorff, we have that $F : J \to F(J)$ is homeomorphism. Next, we identify $\mathcal{E}_U(q)$ and F_q.

Using standard results of differential topology, we have that any neighborhood of $(y,\zeta) \in L^+U$ contains $(y',\zeta') \in L^+U$ such that the geodesic $\gamma_{y',\zeta'}([0,\infty))$ does not intersect $\widehat{\mu}$. Since $(y,\zeta) \mapsto r_0(y,\zeta,s_1)$ is

lower semicontinuous, this implies that $\Sigma_0(s_2, s_1)$ is dense in $\Sigma(s_2, s_1)$. Hence we obtain the closure $\overline{\Sigma}(s_2, s_1)$ of $\Sigma(s_2, s_1)$ as the limits points of $\Sigma_0(s_2, s_1)$.

Then, we obtain the set we $\mathcal{E}_U(J^+(\widehat{\mu}(s_2)) \cap J^-(p^+))$ as the union $\overline{\Sigma}(s_2, s_1) \cup \mathcal{E}_U(J^+(\widehat{\mu}(s_1)) \cap J^-(p^+)) \cup \mathcal{E}_U(\mathcal{K}_{t_0} \cap J^+(\widehat{\mu}(s_2)))$, see (87).

Let $s_0, \dots, s_K \in [s_-, s_+]$ be such that $s_j > s_{j+1} > s_j - \kappa_2$ and $s_K = s_-$. Then, by iterating the above construction so that the values of the parameters s_1 and s_2 are replaced by s_j and s_{j+1}, respectively, we can construct the set $\mathcal{E}_U(J^+(\widehat{\mu}(s_-)) \cap J^-(\widehat{\mu}(s_+)))$.

Moreover, similarly to the above construction, we can find the sets $\mathcal{E}_U(J^+(\widehat{\mu}(s')) \cap J^-(\widehat{\mu}(s''))$ for all $s_- < s' < s'' < s_+$, and taking their union, we construct the set $\mathcal{E}_U(I(\widehat{\mu}(s_-), \widehat{\mu}(s_+))$. □

Theorem 1.5 will follows from Proposition 4.11 when Theorem 4.11 is proven. Thus we consider next the proof of Theorem 4.11 and return later to the proof of Theorem 1.5.

5. Solution of the inverse problem for passive observations

In this section we prove Theorem 1.2. Earlier we have shown that the conformal type of $(U, g|_U)$ and the collection $\mathcal{E}_U(W)$ determine the collection of the earliest observation times $\mathcal{F}(W) \subset C(\overline{\mathcal{A}})$. In the proof of Proposition 2.2 we have shown that the topology of $C(\overline{\mathcal{A}})$ induces on the set $\mathcal{F}(W)$ a topology that makes it homeomorphic to W. In this section we construct on $\mathcal{F}(W)$ smooth coordinates and show that then $\mathcal{F}(W)$ is diffeomorphic to W. After this we construct a metric on $\mathcal{F}(W)$ that makes it conformal to $(W, g|_W)$.

The proof is constructive and to simplify the notations, we do constructions on just one Lorentzian manifold, (M, g) and assume that we are given the data

(91) the differentiable manifold U, the conformal class of $g|_U$,
the paths $\mu_a : [-1, 1] \to U$, $a \in \mathcal{A}$, and the set $\mathcal{E}_U(W)$,

where W is a relatively compact open set such that $\overline{W} \subset I^-(p^+) \setminus J^-(p^-)$.

In this section we do not use the functions f_a^- and denote

$$f_a(x) = f_a^+(x).$$

Also we use the notations defined in Section 2.

5.1. **Construction of the differentiable structure.** Let us next consider the set $\mathcal{Z} = \{(q, p) \in W \times U;\ p \in \mathcal{E}_U^{reg}(q)\}$. For every $(q, p) \in \mathcal{Z}$ there is a unique $\xi \in L_q^+M$ such that $\gamma_{q,\xi}(1) = p$ and $\rho(q, \xi) > 1$. We will denote $\Theta(q, p) = (q, \xi)$ that defines a map by $\Theta : \mathcal{Z} \to L^+W$. Below, let $\mathcal{W}_\varepsilon(q_0, \xi_0) \subset TM$ be an ε-neighborhood of (q_0, ξ_0) with respect to the Sasaki-metric induced by g^+ on TM.

Lemma 5.1. *Let $(q_0, p_0) \in \mathcal{Z}$ and $(q_0, \xi_0) = \Theta(q_0, p_0)$. When $\varepsilon > 0$ is small enough, the map*

$$X : \mathcal{W}_\varepsilon(q_0, \xi_0) \to M \times M, \quad X(q, \xi) = (q, \exp_q(\xi)) \tag{92}$$

is open and defines a diffeomorphism $X : \mathcal{W}_\varepsilon(q_0, \xi_0) \to \mathcal{U}_\varepsilon(q_0, p_0) := X(\mathcal{W}_\varepsilon(q_0, \xi_0))$. When ε is small enough, Θ coincides in $\mathcal{Z} \cap \mathcal{U}_\varepsilon(q_0, p_0)$ with the inverse map of X. Moreover, $\mathcal{Z}$ is a $(2n-1)$-dimensional manifold and the map $\Theta : \mathcal{Z} \to L^+M$ is C^∞-smooth.

Proof. We start the proof with some technical considerations.

Let $p_{+2} = \widehat{\mu}(s_{+2})$, $s_+ < s_{+2} < 1$. For $(x, \xi) \in L^+M$, $x \in J^-(p^+)$, the value $T_{+2}(x, \xi) = \sup\{t \geq 0 \ ; \ \gamma_{x,\xi}(t) \in J^-(p_{+2})\}$, is finite by [63, Lem. 14.13]. Since $J_2 = J^-(p_{+2})$ is closed and $\gamma_{x,\xi}$, $(x, \xi) \in L^+M$, are future-pointing curves, we have that $T_{+2} : L^+J_2 \to \mathbb{R}$ is upper semicontinuous. As $W \subset J^-(p_{+2})$ is relatively compact, the set

$$K = \{(x, \xi) \in L^+M; \ x \in \mathrm{cl}\,(W), \ \|\xi\|_{g^+} = 1\} \tag{93}$$

is compact and there is $c_0 \in \mathbb{R}_+$ such that $T_{+2}(x, \xi) \leq c_0$ for all $(x, \xi) \in K$.

Let us now start the proof of the claim. Since the geodesic $\gamma_{q_0,\xi_0}([0, 1])$ does not contain cut points and thus conjugate points, we see that when $\varepsilon > 0$ is small enough, the set $\mathcal{U}_\varepsilon(q_0, p_0) = X(\mathcal{W}_\varepsilon(q_0, \xi_0)) \subset M \times M$ is open and the map $X : \mathcal{W}_\varepsilon(q_0, \xi_0) \to \mathcal{U}_\varepsilon(q_0, p_0)$ has a C^∞-smooth inverse map $X^{-1} : \mathcal{U}_\varepsilon(q_0, p_0) \to \mathcal{W}_\varepsilon(q_0, \xi_0)$. Thus $X : \mathcal{W}_\varepsilon(q_0, \xi_0) \to \mathcal{U}_\varepsilon(q_0, p_0)$ is a diffeomorphism. Note that $X^{-1}(q_0, p_0) = (q_0, \xi_0)$.

First, we prove that $\Theta : \mathcal{Z} \to L^+W$ is continuous. If $\Theta : \mathcal{Z} \to L^+W$ would not be continuous at $(q_0, p_0) \in \mathcal{Z}$, there would exists a sequence $(q_k, p_k) \in \mathcal{Z}$ converging to (q_0, p_0) as $k \to \infty$, such that $\Theta(q_k, p_k) \in L^+M$ does not converge to $(q_0, \xi_0) = \Theta(q_0, p_0)$.

Since $p_k \in J^-(p_{+2})$ and the function T_{+2} is bounded by $c_0 \in \mathbb{R}_+$ in the set K given in (93), the sequence $\|\Theta(q_k, p_k)\|_{g^+}$ is uniformly bounded. By considering a subsequence we may assume that $\Theta(q_k, p_k) \to (q_0, \eta) \in L^+M$ as $k \to \infty$ and $\eta \neq \xi_0$. In this case the geodesics $\gamma_{q_0,\xi_0}([0, 1])$ and $\gamma_{q_0,\eta}([0, 1])$ would be two light-like geodesics connecting q_0 to p_0 so that $\rho(q_0, \xi_0) \leq 1$. This would be in contradiction with the assumption that $p_0 \in \mathcal{E}_U^{reg}(q_0)$. This shows that $\Theta : \mathcal{Z} \to L^+W$ is continuous at (q_0, p_0).

Let $\varepsilon_1 \in (0, \varepsilon)$ and $\mathcal{Z} \cap \mathcal{U}_{\varepsilon_1}(q_0, p_0)$ be a neighborhood of (q_0, p_0) in the relative topology of $\mathcal{Z} \subset W \times U$. When ε_1 is small enough, we have $\Theta(\mathcal{Z} \cap \mathcal{U}_{\varepsilon_1}(q_0, p_0)) \subset \mathcal{W}_\varepsilon(q_0, \xi_0)$. Then for $(q, p) \in \mathcal{Z} \cap \mathcal{U}_{\varepsilon_1}(q_0, p_0)$ and $(q, \xi) = \Theta(q, p) \in \mathcal{W}_\varepsilon(q_0, \xi_0)$ we have $\exp_q(\xi) = p$, and hence $X(\Theta(q, p)) = (q, p)$. Since $\Theta(q, p) \in \mathcal{W}_\varepsilon(q_0, \xi_0)$, we have $\Theta(q, p) = X^{-1}(q, p)$. Therefore for $(q, p) \in \mathcal{Z} \cap \mathcal{U}_{\varepsilon_1}(q_0, p_0)$ the function $\Theta : \mathcal{Z} \cap \mathcal{U}_{\varepsilon_1}(q_0, p_0) \to TM$ coincides with the smooth function $X^{-1} : \mathcal{Z} \cap \mathcal{U}_{\varepsilon_1}(q_0, p_0) \to TM$. Given that $(q_0, p_0) \in \mathcal{Z}$ is arbitrary, this

shows that $\mathcal{Z}$ is a $(2n-1)$-dimensional manifold and $\Theta : \mathcal{Z} \to L^+M$ is C^∞-smooth. □

Proposition 5.2. *Let $q_0 \in I^-(p^+) \setminus J^-(p^-)$ and $(q_0, p_j) \in \mathcal{Z}$, $j = 1, 2, \dots, n$ and $\xi_j \in L^+_{q_0}M$ be such that $\gamma_{q_0,\xi_j}(1) = p_j$. Assume that ξ_j, $j = 1, 2, \dots, n$ are linearly independent. Then, if $a_j \in \mathcal{A}$ and $\vec{a} = (a_j)_{j=1}^n$ are such that $p_j \in \mu_{a_j}$, there is a neighborhood $V_1 \subset M$ of q_0 such that the corresponding observation time functions*

$$\mathbf{f}_{\vec{a}}(q) = (f_{a_j}(q))_{j=1}^n$$

define C^∞-smooth coordinates in V_1. Moreover, $\nabla f_{a_j}|_{q_0}$, the gradient of f_{a_j} with respect to q at q_0 satisfies $\nabla f_{a_j}|_{q_0} = c_j\xi_j$ for some $c_j \neq 0$.

Proof. Let $(q_0, p_0) \in \mathcal{Z}$ and $\xi_0 \in L^+_{q_0}M$ such that $\gamma_{q_0,\xi_0}(1) = p_0$. Moreover, let $\varepsilon > 0$ be so small that the map $X : \mathcal{W}_\varepsilon(q_0, \xi_0) \to \mathcal{U}_\varepsilon(q_0, p_0)$ has a C^∞-smooth inverse, see (92). We denote this inverse map by

$$X^{-1}(q, p) = (q, \xi(q, p)). \tag{94}$$

Recall that we denote $\mathcal{W} = \mathcal{W}_\varepsilon(q_0, \xi_0)$ and $\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{U}_\varepsilon(q_0, p_0)$.

We associate with any $(q, p) \in \mathcal{W}$ the energy $E(q, p) = E(\gamma_{q,\xi(q,p)}([0, 1]))$ of the geodesic segment $\gamma_{q,\xi(q,p)}([0, 1])$ from p to q. Here, the energy of a piecewise smooth curve $\alpha : [0, l] \to M$ is defined by

$$E(\alpha) = \frac{1}{2}\int_0^l g(\dot\alpha(t), \dot\alpha(t))\, dt.$$

Observe that the sign of $E(q, p)$ depends on the causal nature of $\gamma_{q,p}$. In particular, $E(q, p) = 0$ if and only if $\xi(q, p)$ is light-like. Moreover, since X^{-1} is C^∞-smooth on $\mathcal{U}$, also $E(q, p)$ is C^∞-smooth in $\mathcal{U}$.

Let us return to consider $(q_0, p_0) \in \mathcal{Z}$ and let $a_0 \in \mathcal{A}$ be such that $p_0 \in \mu_{a_0}$. Then $p_0 = \mu_{a_0}(s_0)$ with $s_0 = f_{a_0}(q)$.

Let $V_0 \subset W$ be an open neighborhood of q_0 and $t_1, t_2 \in (s_{-2}, s_{+2})$, $t_1 < s_0 < t_2$ be such that $V_0 \times \mu_{a_0}([t_1, t_2]) \subset \mathcal{U}$. Then for $q \in V_0$ and $s \in (t_1, t_2)$ the function $\mathbf{E}_{a_0}(q, s) := E(q, \mu_{a_0}(s))$ is well defined and smooth. Using the first variation formula for $\mathbf{E}_{a_0}(q, s)$, see e.g. [63, Prop. 10.39], we obtain

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{E}_{a_0}(q_0, s)}{\partial s}\Big|_{s=s_0} = g\left(\eta,\, \dot\mu_{a_0}(f_{a_0}(q_0))\right), \quad \nabla \mathbf{E}_{a_0}(q, s_0)\Big|_{q=q_0} = -\xi_0, \tag{95}$$

where $\xi_0 = \xi(q_0, p_0)$ and $\eta = \dot\gamma_{q_0,\xi_0}(1)$, see (94). Since $\dot\mu_{a_0}(s)$ is time-like and future-pointing and η is light-like and future-pointing, $\frac{\partial \mathbf{E}_{a_0}}{\partial s}(q_0, s_0) < 0$.

It follows from the implicit function theorem that there is an open neighborhood $V_{a_0} \subset V_0$ of q_0 and a smooth function $q \mapsto s(q, a_0)$ defined for $q \in V_{a_0}$ such that $s(q_0, a_0) = f_{a_0}(q_0)$ and $\mathbf{E}_{a_0}(q, s(q, a_0)) = 0$. Then

$q \mapsto s(q, a_0)$ and $q \mapsto f_{a_0}(q)$ coincide in V_{a_0}, and it follows from (95) that

$$\nabla f_{a_0}(q)\Big|_{q=q_0} = \frac{1}{c(q_0, a_0)}\xi_0,\ c(q_0, a_0) = \frac{\partial \mathbf{E}_{a_0}}{\partial s}(q_0, s))\Big|_{s=f_{a_0}(q_0)}. \tag{96}$$

Next we choose $p_1, p_2, \dots, p_n \in \mathcal{E}_U^{reg}(q_0)$ and let $\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n \in L_{q_0}^+(M)$ be such that $p_i = \gamma_{q_0,\xi_i}(1)$. We assume that $\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n \in L_{q_0}^+(M)$ are linearly independent. Moreover, let $a_j \in \mathcal{A}$ be such that $p_j \in \mu_{a_j}$ and $\vec{a} = (a_j)_{j=1}^n$. Finally, we denote by $q \mapsto s(q, a_j)$ the above constructed smooth functions that are defined in some neighborhoods $V_{a_j} \subset W$ of q_0

Let $V_{\vec{a}} = \bigcap_{j=1}^n V_{a_j}$ and consider the map

$$\mathbf{f}_{\vec{a}} : V_{\vec{a}} \to \mathbb{R}^n, \quad \mathbf{f}_{\vec{a}}(q) = (f_{a_1}(q), \dots, f_{a_n}(q)).$$

It follows from (96) that the map $\mathbf{f}_{\vec{a}}$ has an invertible differential at q_0 and, therefore, the function $\mathbf{f}_{\vec{a}} : V_{\vec{a}} \to \mathbb{R}^n$ defines a C^∞-smooth coordinate system in some neighborhood of q_0. □

5.1.1. *Properties of the C^0 and C^∞ smooth coordinates.*

Definition 5.3. *Let $\vec{a} = (a_j)_{j=1}^n \in \mathcal{A}^n$, $\mathcal{O} \subset \mathcal{F}(W)$ be an open set, $s_{a_j} = f_{a_j} \circ \mathcal{F}^{-1}$, and $\mathbf{s}_{\vec{a}} = \mathbf{f}_{\vec{a}} \circ \mathcal{F}^{-1}$. We say that $(\mathcal{O}, \mathbf{s}_{\vec{a}})$ are C^0-observation coordinates on $\mathcal{F}(W)$ if the map $\mathbf{s}_{\vec{a}} : \mathcal{O} \to \mathbb{R}^n$ is an open and injective map. Also, we say that $(\mathcal{O}, \mathbf{s}_{\vec{a}})$ are C^∞-observation coordinates on $\mathcal{F}(W)$ if $\mathbf{s}_{\vec{a}} \circ \mathcal{F} : \mathcal{F}^{-1}(\mathcal{O}) \to \mathbb{R}^n$ are C^∞-smooth local coordinates on $W \subset M$, see Fig. 1(Right).*

Note that, by the invariance of domain theorem, the above continuous map $\mathbf{s}_{\vec{a}} : \mathcal{O} \to \mathbb{R}^n$ is open if it is injective. Even though for a given $\vec{a} \in \mathcal{A}^n$ there are several sets $\mathcal{O}$ for which $(\mathcal{O}, \mathbf{s}_{\vec{a}})$ form C^0-observation coordinates, to clarify the notations, we sometimes denote the coordinates $(\mathcal{O}, \mathbf{s}_{\vec{a}})$ by $(\mathcal{O}_{\vec{a}}, \mathbf{s}_{\vec{a}})$.

Since $\mathcal{F} : W \to \mathcal{F}(W)$ is a homeomorphism, we can determine all C^0-observation coordinates on $\mathcal{F}(W)$ using data (91). Next we will consider $\mathcal{F}(W)$ as a topological manifold endowed with the C^0-observation coordinates and denote $\mathcal{F}(W) = \widetilde{W}$. We denote the points of this manifold by $\widetilde{q} = \mathcal{F}(q)$. Next we construct a differentiable structure on $\widetilde{W}$ that is compatible with that of W.

5.1.2. *Construction of the C^∞ smooth coordinates.*

Lemma 5.4. *Assume that we are given data (91). Then for any C^0-observation coordinates $(\mathcal{O}_{\vec{a}}, \mathbf{s}_{\vec{a}})$ with $\vec{a} \in \mathcal{A}^n$ we can determine if $(\mathcal{O}_{\vec{a}}, \mathbf{s}_{\vec{a}})$ are C^∞-observation coordinates on $\widetilde{W}$. Moreover, for any $\widetilde{q} \in \widetilde{W}$ there exists C^∞-observation coordinates $(\mathcal{O}_{\vec{a}}, \mathbf{s}_{\vec{a}})$ such that $\widetilde{q} \in \mathcal{O}_{\vec{a}}$.*

Proof. Let $q \in W$. We say that $p \in \mathcal{E}_U(q)$ and $a \in \mathcal{A}$ are associated if $p \in \mu_a$. Next, consider $p \in \mathcal{E}_U^{reg}(q)$ and $a \in \mathcal{A}$ that are associated. Note that then $q \notin \mu_a$. By (96), the function $f_a(q)$ satisfies

$$\nabla f_a(q) = c(q,a)\,\xi(q,y), \quad c(q,a) \neq 0,$$

where $y = \mu_a(f_a^+(q))$, see (94). Let

$$K(q) = \{(\xi_j)_{j=1}^n;\ \xi_j \in L_q^+M,\ \rho(q,\xi_j) > 1,\ \gamma_{q,\xi_j}(1) \in U\}$$

and $H : K(q) \to U^n$ be the map $H((\xi_j)_{j=1}^n) = (p_j)_{j=1}^n$, where $p_j = \gamma_{q,\xi_j}(1)$. Then $p_j \in \mathcal{E}_U^{reg}(q)$ and $\xi_j = \Theta(q,p_j)$. Given that ρ is lower semi-continuous, we have that $K(q) \subset (L_q^+M)^n$ is open. Clearly, H is C^∞-smooth. Since $\Theta : \mathcal{Z} \to L^+W$ is continuous and injective, we see that $H : K(q) \to H(K(q)) = (\mathcal{E}_U^{reg}(q))^n$ is a homeomorphism. We denote below $Y(q) = (\mathcal{E}_U^{reg}(q))^n$. Note that for all $\widetilde{q} \in \widetilde{W}$ the data (91) determine the set $Y(q) \subset U^n$, where $q = \mathcal{F}^{-1}(\widetilde{q})$.

Let us consider the set

$$K_0(q) = \{(\xi_j)_{j=1}^n \in K(q);\ \xi_j,\ j = 1,\dots,n \text{ are linearly independent}\}.$$

Clearly, the set $K_0(q)$ is dense and open in $K(q)$, and hence $Y_0(q) := H(K_0(q))$ is open and dense in $Y(q)$.

Let $(\mathcal{O}_{\vec{a}}, \mathbf{s}_{\vec{a}})$, $\vec{a} \in \mathcal{A}^n$ be C^0-observation coordinates on $\widetilde{W}$, $\widetilde{q} \in \mathcal{O}_{\vec{a}}$, and $q = \mathcal{F}^{-1}(\widetilde{q})$. Also, let $(p_j)_{j=1}^n \in Y(q)$ be such that the p_j's are associated with a_j. Similarly, let $(\mathcal{O}_{\vec{b}}, \mathbf{s}_{\vec{b}})$, $\vec{b} \in \mathcal{A}^n$ be another C^0-observation coordinates on $\widetilde{W}$ such that $\widetilde{q} \in \mathcal{O}_{\vec{b}}$, and let $(z_j)_{j=1}^n \in Y(q)$ be such that z_j are associated with b_j. Note that then $p_j = \mathcal{E}_{a_j}^{reg}(q)$ and $z_j = \mathcal{E}_{b_j}^{reg}(q)$.

In the case when $z_j)_{j=1}^n \in Y_0(q)$, q has a neighborhood $V_1 \subset W$ in which the function $\mathbf{f}_{\vec{b}} : V_1 \to \mathbb{R}^n$ give C^∞-smooth local coordinates. Thus, if $(z_j)_{j=1}^n \in Y_0(q)$, then it holds that $(p_j)_{j=1}^n \in Y_0(q)$ if and only if

(*i*)The functions $s_{a_j} \circ \mathbf{s}_{\vec{b}}^{-1}$, $j = 1,2,\dots,n$ are C^∞-smooth at $\mathbf{s}_{\vec{b}}(\widetilde{q})$ and the Jacobian determinant $\det(D(\mathbf{s}_{\vec{a}} \circ \mathbf{s}_{\vec{b}}^{-1}))$ at $\mathbf{s}_{\vec{b}}(\widetilde{q})$ is non-zero.

Denote $\vec{p} = (p_j)_{j=1}^n \in Y(q)$, and define $\mathcal{X}_{\vec{p}} \subset Y(q)$ to be the set of those $(z_j)_{j=1}^n \in Y(q)$, for which there are $\vec{b} \in \mathcal{A}^n$ and C^0-observation coordinates $(\mathcal{O}_{\vec{b}}, \mathbf{s}_{\vec{b}})$ such that $\widetilde{q} = \mathcal{F}(q) \in \mathcal{O}_{\vec{b}}$, z_j are associated with b_j for $j = 1,2,\dots,n$, and the condition (i) is satisfied. If $\vec{p}$ is in $Y_0(q)$, we see that $Y_0(q) \subset \mathcal{X}_{\vec{p}}$. On the other hand, if $\vec{p}$ is not in $Y_0(q)$, we have $Y_0(q) \cap \mathcal{X}_{\vec{p}} = \emptyset$. Since the set $Y_0(q)$ is open and dense in $Y(q)$, we observe that $\vec{p} \in Y_0(q)$ if and only if the interior of set $\mathcal{X}_{\vec{p}}$ is a dense subset of $Y(q)$. This in particular implies that using the data (91) we can determine whether $(p_j)_{j=1}^n$ is in $Y_0(q)$ or not. As we can do the above considerations for all $\widetilde{q} \in \mathcal{O}_{\vec{a}}$, we get that the C^0-observation coordinates $(\mathcal{O}_{\vec{a}}, \mathbf{s}_{\vec{a}})$, $\vec{a} \in \mathcal{A}^n$ are C^∞-observation

coordinates on $\widetilde{W}$ if and only if for all $\widetilde{q} \in \mathcal{O}_{\vec{a}}$, $q = \mathcal{F}^{-1}(\widehat{q})$, and $p_j = \mu_{a_j}(f^+_{a_j}(q))$, $j = 1, 2, \ldots, n$ we have $(p_j)_{j=1}^n \in Y_0(q)$. Thus we can determine all C^0-observation coordinates $(\mathcal{O}_{\vec{a}}, \mathbf{s}_{\vec{a}})$ on $\widetilde{W}$ that are C^∞-observation coordinates. Moreover, since for all $q \in W$ the set $Y_0(q)$ is non-empty, we obtain that any $\widetilde{q} = \mathcal{F}(q) \in \widetilde{W}$ belongs in the domain some C^∞-observation coordinates. □

We endow $\widetilde{W} = \mathcal{F}(W)$ with the differentiable structure provided by all C^∞-observation coordinates on $\widetilde{W}$. By Lemma 5.4 and [63, Lem. 1.42] the C^∞-observation coordinates make $\widetilde{W}$ a differentiable manifold and its the differentiable structure is uniquely determined. Since the differentiable structure of W is determined by the functions $f_{\vec{a}}$ that are C^∞-smooth local coordinates, we have using Def. 5.3 that the map

$$\mathcal{F} : W \to \widetilde{W} = \mathcal{F}(W) \tag{97}$$

is a diffeomorphism.

5.2. **Construction of the conformal type of the metric.** Let us denote by $\widetilde{g} = \mathcal{F}_* g$ the metric on $\widetilde{W} = \mathcal{F}(W)$ that makes $\mathcal{F}$ an isometry. Next we show that the set $\mathcal{F}(W)$, the paths μ_a and the conformal class of the metric g on U determine the conformal class of $\widetilde{g}$ on $\widetilde{W}$.

Lemma 5.5. *The data (91) determines a metric G on $\widetilde{W} = \mathcal{F}(W)$ that is conformal to $\widetilde{g}$ and the time orientation on $\widetilde{W}$ that makes $\mathcal{F} : W \to \widetilde{W}$ a causality preserving map.*

Proof. Let $(\mathcal{O}_{\vec{a}}, \mathbf{s}_{\vec{a}})$ be C^∞-observation coordinates on $\widetilde{W}$. Then by (96) the co-vectors $-ds_{a_1}|_{\widetilde{q}}$ and $-ds_{a_2}|_{\widetilde{q}}$ are non-parallel future-pointing light-like co-vectors. Thus their sum determines a future-pointing time-like co-vector field on $\mathcal{O}_{\vec{a}}$. Using a suitable partition of unity we can construct a future-pointing time-like co-vector field X on $\widetilde{W}$.

Let $(\mathcal{O}_{\vec{a}}, \mathbf{s}_{\vec{a}})$ be C^∞-observation coordinates on $\widetilde{W}$. Let $\widetilde{q} \in \mathcal{O}_{\vec{a}}$ and $q \in W$ be such that $\widetilde{q} = \mathcal{F}(q)$. Using the data (91), the function $F_q = \mathcal{F}(q) : \mathcal{A} \to \mathbb{R}$, and the formula (18), we can determine the set $\mathcal{E}_U(q) \subset U$. By Prop. 2.7 (iii), this further determines the set $\mathcal{C}^{reg}_U(q)$.

Then, let us fix a point $\widetilde{q} = \mathcal{F}(q) \in \mathcal{O}_{\vec{a}}$. Let $(y, \eta) \in \mathcal{C}^{reg}_U(q)$ and let $\widehat{t} > 0$ be the largest number such that the geodesic $\gamma_{y,\eta}((-\widehat{t}, 0]) \subset M$ is defined and has no cut points. For $q \in W$, Proposition 2.6 (ii) yields that $q \in \gamma_{y,\eta}((-\widehat{t}, 0))$ if and only if $(y, \eta) \in \mathcal{C}^{reg}_U(q)$. Hence (y, η) and the data (91) determine the set

$$\beta = \{\widetilde{q} \in \mathcal{O}_{\vec{a}};\ \widetilde{q} = \mathcal{F}(q),\ \mathcal{C}^{reg}_U(q) \ni (y, \eta)\} = \mathcal{F}(\gamma_{y,\eta}((-\widehat{t}, 0))) \cap \mathcal{O}_{\vec{a}}.$$

This implies that on $\mathcal{O}_{\vec{a}} \subset \widetilde{W}$ we can find the image, in the map $\mathcal{F}$, of the light-like geodesic segment $\gamma_{y,\eta}((-\widehat{t}, 0)) \cap \mathcal{F}^{-1}(\mathcal{O}_{\vec{a}})$ that contains $q = \gamma_{y,\eta}(-t_1)$. Let $\alpha(s)$, $s \in (-s_0, s_0)$ be a smooth path on $\mathcal{O}_{\vec{a}}$ such that $\partial_s \alpha(s)$ does not vanish, $\alpha((-s_0, s_0)) \subset \beta$, and $\alpha(0) = \widehat{q}$. Such

smooth path $\alpha(s)$ can be obtained e.g. by parametrizing β by arc-length with respect to some auxiliary smooth Riemannian metric on $\mathcal{O}_{\vec{a}}$. Then $\widetilde{\xi} = \partial_s \alpha(s)|_{s=0} \in T_{\widehat{q}}\widetilde{W}$ has the form $\widetilde{\xi} = c\mathcal{F}_*(\dot{\gamma}_{y,\eta}(t_1))$ where $c \neq 0$. Since we can do the above construction for all points $(y,\eta) \in \mathcal{C}_U^{reg}(q)$, we determine in the tangent space $T_{\widehat{q}}\widetilde{W}$ the set $\Gamma = \mathcal{F}_*(\{c\xi \in L_qM;\ \exp_q(\xi) \in \mathcal{E}_U^{reg}(q),\ c \in \mathbb{R},\ c \neq 0\})$, that is an open, non-empty subset of the light cone at $\widehat{q}$ associated to the metric $\widetilde{g}$. Let us now consider the set Γ in the coordinates of $T_{\widehat{q}}\widetilde{W}$ associated to $\mathbf{s}_{\vec{a}}$. Since the light cone is determined by a quadratic equation in the tangent space, having an open set Γ of the light cone we can uniquely determine the whole light cone. Using this construction with all points $\widehat{q} \in \mathcal{O}_{\vec{a}}$, we can determine all light-like vectors in the tangent space $T_{\widehat{q}}\mathcal{O}_{\vec{a}}$ for all $\widehat{q} \in \mathcal{O}_{\vec{a}}$. The collections of light-like vectors at tangent spaces of $\widetilde{W}$ determine uniquely the conformal class of the tensor $\widetilde{g} = \mathcal{F}_* g$ in the manifold $\widetilde{W}$, see [5, Thm. 2.3] (or [5, Lem. 2.1] for a constructive procedure).

The above shows that the data (91) determines the conformal class of the metric tensor $\widetilde{g}$. In particular, we can construct a metric G on $\widetilde{W}$ that is conformal to $\widetilde{g}$ and satisfies $G(X,X) = -1$. □

We have shown that the data (91) determine the topological and the differentiable structures on $\widetilde{W} = \mathcal{F}(W)$ and a metric G on it that makes the map $\mathcal{F} : (W, g|_W) \to (\widetilde{W}, G)$ a diffeomorphism and a conformal map. Moreover, we determine the time-orientation on $\widetilde{W}$ that makes $\mathcal{F}$ a causality preserving map.

Finally, by Prop. 2.7 *(i)*, for any $y \in U$ we can identify if $y = q \in W$ and find the corresponding element $\mathcal{F}(q) \in \mathcal{F}(W)$. Thus we can find the set $\mathcal{F}(W \cap U)$ and the map $\mathcal{F}^{-1} : \mathcal{F}(W \cap U) \to W \cap U$. This yields the claim (ii) of Thm. 1.2. Thus Theorem 1.2 is proven. □

5.2.1. *Construction of the conformal factor in the vacuum spacetime.*

Proof of Corollary 1.3. By Theorem 1.2, there is a conformal diffeomorphism $\Psi : (W_1, g^{(1)}) \to (W_1, g^{(2)})$. By our assumptions, $\Phi : (V_1, g^{(1)}) \to (V_1, g^{(2)})$ is an isometry, the Ricci curvature of $g^{(j)}$ is zero in W_j, and any point $x_1 \in W_1$ is connected to some point $y_1 \in V_1 \cap W_1$ with a piecewise smooth path $\mu_{y_1,x_1}([0,1]) \subset W_1$, $\mu_{y_1,x_1}(0) = y_1$. Note that then $\Psi(\mu_{x_1,y_1}([0,1])) \subset W_2$ connects $x_2 = \Psi(x_1)$ to $y_2 = \Psi(y_1)$.

To simplify notations we denote $\widehat{g} = g^{(1)}$ and $g = \Psi^* g^{(2)}$. Since Ψ is conformal, there is $f : W_1 \to \mathbb{R}$ such that $\widehat{g} = e^{2f} g$ on W_1, and as $\Phi : V_1 \to V_2$ is an isometry, $f = 0$ in V_1. By [67, formula (2.73)],the Ricci tensors $\mathrm{Ric}_{jk}(g)$ of g and $\mathrm{Ric}_{jk}(\widehat{g})$ of $\widehat{g}$ satisfy on W_1

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = \mathrm{Ric}_{jk}(\widehat{g}) \ &= \ \mathrm{Ric}_{jk}(g) - 2\nabla_j\nabla_k f + 2(\nabla_j f)(\nabla_k f) \\ &\quad -(g^{pq}\nabla_p\nabla_q f + 2g^{pq}(\nabla_p f)(\nabla_q f))g_{jk} \end{aligned}$$

where $\nabla = \nabla^g$. For the scalar curvature this yields

$$0 = e^{2f}\widehat{g}^{pq}\mathrm{Ric}_{pq}(\widehat{g}) = g^{pq}\mathrm{Ric}_{pq}(g) - 3g^{pq}\nabla_p\nabla_q f.$$

Combining the above with the fact that $\mathrm{Ric}_{jk}(g) = 0$, we obtain

$$\nabla_j\nabla_k f - (\nabla_j f)(\nabla_k f) + g^{pq}(\nabla_p f)(\nabla_q f)g_{jk} = 0.$$

This equation gives a system of first order ordinary differential equations for the vector field $Y = \nabla f$ along $\mu_{y_1,x_1}([0,1])$ with initial value $Y(y_1) = \nabla f(y_1) = 0$, that has the unique solution $Y = 0$. As $f(y_1) = 0$, we obtain $f(\mu_{y_1,x_1}(t)) = 0$ for $t \in [0,1]$. Since all points $x \in W_1$ are connected in W_1 to the set V_1 by piecewise smooth paths, this shows that $f = 0$. □

Finally, we are ready to complete the proof of the main theorem for active measurements.

Proof. (of Theorem 1.5) Theorem 1.5 follows from Proposition 4.11 and Theorem 1.2. □

Remark 5.1. The proof of Theorem 1.5 can be used to do an approximative reconstruction of the set $I(p^-, p^+) = I^+(p^-) \cap I^-(p^+)$ and its conformal structure with only one measurement under certain geometric conditions, that is, one can use one suitably constructed source f, measure $L_U(f)$, and construct an approximation of the conformal class of the metric g in $I(p^-, p^+)$. In the proof above we showed that it is possible to use the non-linearity to create an artificial point source at a point $q \in I(p^-, p^+)$. Using the same method it is possible to create an arbitrary finite number of artificial point sources with a single source f. For this, we can use a source f that is a sum of a large number of modified point sources in U that produce spherical waves having different order of smoothnesses. The interaction of such spherical waves produces even a larger number of artificial point sources in $I(p^-, p^+)$ that all have a different order of smoothness. As a very rough analogy, we can produce in $I(p^-, p^+)$ an arbitrarily dense collection of artificial points sources that all have different "colors". Using this we can show using similar methods to those in [2, 34] that the measurement with one source f determines, in a suitable compact class of Lorentzian manifolds having no conjugate points, an approximation (in a suitable sense) of the conformal class of the manifold $(J(p^-, p^+), g)$. The details of this construction will be considered elsewhere.

Acknowledgements. The authors express their gratitude to MSRI, the Newton Institute, the Fields Institute and the Mittag-Leffler Institute, where parts of this work have been done.

YK was partly supported by EPSRC and the AXA professorship. ML was partly supported by the Finnish Centre of Excellence in Inverse Problems Research 2012-2017 and an Academy Professorship. GU was partly supported by NSF, a Clay Senior Award at MSRI, a

Chancellor Professorship at UC Berkeley, a Rothschild Distinguished Visiting Fellowship at the Newton Institute, the Fondation de Sciences Mathématiques de Paris, FiDiPro professorship, and a Simons Fellowship.

References

[1] P. Alinhac: Non-Unicite du Probleme de Cauchy, *Annals of Mathematics*, 117 (1983), 77–108.

[2] M. Anderson, A. Katsuda, Y. Kurylev, M. Lassas, M. Taylor: Boundary regularity for the Ricci equation, Geometric Convergence, and Gel'fand's Inverse Boundary Problem, *Inventiones Mathematicae* 158 (2004), 261-321.

[3] V. Babich, V. Ulin: The complex space-time ray method and "quasiphotons." (Russian) *Zap. Nauchn. Sem. LOMI* 117 (1981), 5–12.

[4] C. Bär, N. Ginoux, F. Pfäffle: *Wave equations on Lorentzian manifolds and quantization*, ESI Lectures in Mathematics and Physics, 2007, 202 pp.

[5] J. Beem, P. Ehrlich, K. Easley: *Global Lorentzian geometry*, Pure and. Applied Mathematics, vol. 67, Dekker, 1981, p. 270

[6] M. Belishev: An approach to multidimensional inverse problems for the wave equation. (Russian) *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR* 297 (1987), 524–527.

[7] M. Belishev, Y. Kurylev: To the reconstruction of a Riemannian manifold via its spectral data (BC-method). *Comm. PDE* 17 (1992), 767–804.

[8] A. Bernal, M. Sanchez: Globally hyperbolic spacetimes can be defined as "causal" instead of "strongly causal", *Class. Quant. Grav.* 24 (2007) 745-750.

[9] A. Bernal, M. Sanchez: Smoothness of time functions and the metric splitting of globally hyperbolic spacetimes. *Comm. Math. Phys.* 257 (2005), 43–50.

[10] V. Brytik, M. de Hoop, M. Salo: Sensitivity analysis of wave-equation tomography: a multi-scale approach. *J. Fourier Anal. Appl.* **16** (2010), 544-589.

[11] V. Chernov, S. Nemirovski: Cosmic censorship of smooth structures. *Comm. Math. Phys.* 320 (2013) 469-473.

[12] Y. Choquet-Bruhat, *General relativity and the Einstein equations*. Oxford Univ. Press, 2009. xxvi+785 pp.

[13] M. Choulli, P. Stefanov: Inverse scattering and inverse boundary value problems for the linear Boltzmann equation. *Comm. PDE* 21 (1996), 763-785.

[14] C. Croke: Rigidity and the distance between boundary points. *J. Diff. Geometry,* 33 (1991), 445–464.

[15] T. Collins, A. Greenleaf, M. Pramanik: A multi-dimensional resolution of singularities with applications. *Amer. J. Math.* 135 (2013), 1179-1252.

[16] M. de Hoop, S. Holman, H. Smith, G. Uhlmann: Regularity and multi-scale discretization of the solution construction of hyperbolic evolution equations of limited smoothness. *Appl. Comput. Harmon. Anal.* **33** (2012), 330-353.

[17] J.-M. Delort: *F.B.I. transformation. Second microlocalization and semilinear caustics*. Lecture Notes in Mathematics, 1522. Springer, 1992. vi+101 pp.

[18] N. Dencker: On the propagation of polarization sets for systems of real principal type, *Journal of Functional Analysis* 46 (1982), 351-372

[19] D. Dos Santos Ferreira, C. Kenig, M. Salo: Determining an unbounded potential from Cauchy data in admissible geometries *Comm. PDE*, 38(2013), 50–68.

[20] J. Duistermaat: *Fourier Integral Operators*, Birkhäuser, 1996. x+142 pp.

[21] G. Eskin: Inverse hyperbolic problems and optical black holes. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **297** (2010), 817–839.

[22] R. Felea, A. Greenleaf: Fourier integral operators with open umbrellas and seismic inversion for cusp caustics, *Math. Res. Lett.* 17 (2010), 867-886.
[23] M. Fridman, et al: Demonstration of temporal cloaking *Nature* 481(2012), 62.
[24] R. Geroch: Domain of dependence. *J. Mathematical Phys.* 11 (1970), 437–449.
[25] C. Graham, M. Zworski: Scattering matrix in conformal geometry. *Invent. Math.*, 152, 89-118, 2003.
[26] C. Guillarmou, A. Sa Barreto: Inverse Problems for Einstein manifolds. *Inverse Prob. Imag.* 3 (2009), 1-15.
[27] C. Guillarmou, M. Salo, L. Tzou: Inverse scattering at fixed energy for surfaces with Euclidean ends. *Comm. Math. Phys.* 303 (2011), 761-784.
[28] A. Greenleaf, G., Uhlmann: Recovering singularities of a potential from singularities of scattering data. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **157** (1993), 549–572.
[29] A. Greenleaf, G. Uhlmann: Estimates for singular Radon transforms and pseudodifferential operators with singular symbols. *J. Funct. Anal.* 89 (1990), no. 1, 202–232.
[30] A. Greenleaf, Y. Kurylev, M. Lassas, G. Uhlmann: Full-wave invisibility of active devices at all frequencies. *Comm. Math. Phys.* 275 (2007), 749-789.
[31] A. Greenleaf, M. Lassas, G. Uhlmann: On nonuniqueness for Calderon's inverse problem, *Math. Res. Lett.* 10 (2003), 685-693.
[32] A. Grigis, J. Sjöstrand: *Microlocal analysis for differential operators: an introduction*, LMS, 1999.
[33] V. Guillemin, G. Uhlmann: Oscillatory integrals with singular symbols. *Duke Math. J.* 48 (1981), 251–267.
[34] T. Helin, M. Lassas, L. Oksanen: An inverse problem for the wave equation with one measurement and the pseudorandom source. *Analysis and PDE* **5** (2012), 887-912.
[35] P. Hoskins: Principles of ultrasound elastography, Ultrasound (20) 2012, 8-15.
[36] T. Hughes, T. Kato; J. Marsden: Well-posed quasi-linear second-order hyperbolic systems with applications to nonlinear elastodynamics and general relativity. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.* 63 (1976), 273–294
[37] L. Hörmander: *The analysis of linear partial differential operators IV.* Springer-Verlag, 1985, vii+352 pp.
[38] V. Isakov: On uniqueness in inverse problems for semilinear parabolic equations. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.* 124 (1993), 1-12.
[39] V. Isakov and A. Nachman: Global uniqueness in a two-dimensional semilinear elliptic inverse problem, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 347 (1995), 3375–3390.
[40] J. Isenberg, R. Mazzeo, D. Pollack: Gluing and wormholes for the Einstein constraint equations, *Comm. Math. Phys.* 231 (2002), 529-568.
[41] J. Isenberg, R. Mazzeo, D. Pollack: Topology of vacuum spacetimes, *Ann. Henri Poincare* 4 (2003), 369 - 383.
[42] M. Joshi, A. Sa Barreto: The generation of semilinear singularities by a swallowtail caustic, *Amer. J. Math.* **120** (1998), 529-550.
[43] H. Kang, G. Nakamura: Identification of nonlinearity in a conductivity equation via the Dirichlet-to-Neumann map. *Inverse Prob.* 18 (2002), 1079-1088.
[44] A. Katchalov, A system of coordinate for describing the "quasiphoton". (Russian) *Zap. Nauch. Semin. LOMI,* 140 (1984), 73–76.
[45] A. Katchalov, Y. Kurylev, M. Lassas: *Inverse boundary spectral problems.* Chapman-Hall/CRC, Boca Raton, FL, 2001. xx+290 pp
[46] T. Kato: Quasi-linear equations of evolution, with applications to partial differential equations. *Spectral theory and differential equations*, pp. 25–70. Lecture Notes in Math., Vol. 448, Springer, 1975.

[47] Y. Kurylev, M. Lassas, G. Uhlmann: Inverse problems in spacetime I: Inverse problems for Einstein equations – Extended preprint version. Arxiv preprint arXiv:1405.4503v1.
[48] Y. Kurylev, M. Lassas, G. Uhlmann: Inverse problems for Einstein equations (a shortened version of [47]), in preparation.
[49] S. Klainerman, I. Rodnianski: Improved local well-posedness for quasi-linear wave equations in dimension three, *Duke Math. J.*, 117 (2003), no 1 , 1-124.
[50] S. Klainerman, I. Rodnianski: A Kirchoff-Sobolev parametrix for wave equations in a curved space-time. *J. Hyperb. Diff. Eq.* 4, (2007), 401-433.
[51] Y. Kurylev, M. Lassas, G. Uhlmann: Rigidity of broken geodesic flow and inverse problems. *Amer. J. Math.* 132 (2010), 529–562.
[52] J. Lee, G. Uhlmann: Determining anisotropic real-analytic conductivities by boundary measurements. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, **42** (1989), 1097–1112.
[53] J. Luk, I. Rodnianski: *Nonlinear interaction of impulsive gravitational waves for the vacuum Einstein equations*, Preprint arXiv:1301.1072.
[54] M. McCall et al: A spacetime cloak, or a history editor, *Journal of Optics* 13 (2011), 024003.
[55] J. McLaughlin, D. Renzi: Shear Wave Speed Recovery in Transient Elastography And Supersonic Imaging Using Propagating Fronts, Inverse Problems 22 (2006), 681-706.
[56] A. Melin, J. Sjöstrand: Fourier integral operators with complex-valued phase functions, in *Fourier Integral Operators and Partial Differential Equations*, Lecture Notes in Math. 459, Springer, 1975.
[57] R. Melrose, A. Sa Barreto, A. Vasy: Asymptotics of solutions of the wave equation on de Sitter-Schwarzschild space. To appear in *Comm. PDE*.
[58] R. Melrose, G. Uhlmann: Lagrangian intersection and the Cauchy problem. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **32** (1979), 483–519.
[59] R. Melrose, N. Ritter: Interaction of nonlinear progressing waves for semilinear wave equations. *Ann. of Math.* **121** (1985), 187–213.
[60] R. Melrose, N. Ritter: Interaction of progressing waves for semilinear wave equations. II. *Ark. Mat.* **25** (1987), 91–114.
[61] G. Nakamura, M. Watanabe: An inverse boundary value problem for a nonlinear wave equation. *Inverse Probl. Imaging* 2 (2008), 121–131.
[62] K. Nomizu, H. Ozeki: The existence of complete Riemannian metrics. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **12** (1961) 889–891.
[63] B. O'Neill, *Semi-Riemannian geometry.* With applications to relativity. Pure and Applied Mathematics, 103. Academic Press, Inc., 1983. xiii+468 pp.
[64] V. Petkov, *Scattering theory for hyperbolic operators.* North-Holland Publ., , 1989. xiv+373 pp.
[65] J. Ralston: Gaussian beams and the propagation of singularities. *Studies in partial differential equations*, 206–248, MAA Stud. Math., 23, 1982
[66] J. Rauch, M. Reed: Singularities produced by the nonlinear interaction of three progressing waves; examples. *Comm. PDE* **7** (1982), 1117–1133.
[67] A. Rendall: *Partial differential equations in general relativity.* Oxford University Press, 2008. xvi+279 pp.
[68] H. Ringström: *The Cauchy Problem in General Relativity*, EMS, 2009, 307 pp.
[69] G. Roach, *Wave scattering by time-dependent perturbations.* Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, 2007. xii+287 pp.
[70] R. Sachs, H. Wu: *General relativity for mathematicians*, Springer 1977, 291 p.
[71] R. Salazar, Determination of time-dependent coefficients for a hyperbolic inverse problem. *Inverse Problems* **29** (2013), 095015, 17 pp.

[72] M. Salo, X. Zhong: An inverse problem for the p-Laplacian: boundary determination. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.* 44 (2012), 2474-2495.
[73] P. Stefanov, Uniqueness of the multi-dimensional inverse scattering problem for time dependent potentials. *Math. Z.* **201** (1989), 541-559.
[74] Z. Sun: On a quasilinear inverse boundary value problem. *Math. Z.* 221 (1996), 293-305.
[75] Z. Sun, G. Uhlmann: Inverse problems in quasilinear anisotropic media. *Amer. J. Math.* 119 (1997), 771-797.
[76] D. Tataru: Unique continuation for solutions to PDE's; between Hörmander's theorem and Holmgren's theorem. *Comm. PDE* 20 (1995), 855–884.
[77] D. Tataru: Unique continuation for operators with partially analytic coefficients. *J. Math. Pures Appl.* 78 (1999), 505–521.
[78] A. Vasy: Diffraction by edges. *Modern Phys. Lett. B* 22 (2008), 2287–2328.
[79] A. Vasy: Propagation of singularities for the wave equation on manifolds with corners. *Ann. of Math.* (2) 168 (2008), 749–812.
[80] A. Vasy: Microlocal analysis of asymptotically hyperbolic and Kerr-de Sitter spaces (with an appendix by S. Dyatlov). *Invent. Math.* 194 (2013), 381-513.
[81] M. Zworski: An example of new singularities in the semilinear interaction of a cusp and a plane, *Comm. PDE* **19** (1994), 901–909.
[82] A supplementary video on colliding waves. Download from the page `http://www.rni.helsinki.fi/~mjl/Relativity-IP-video.html`

Yaroslav Kurylev, UCL; Matti Lassas, University of Helsinki; Gunther Uhlmann, University of Washington, and University of Helsinki.
y.kurylev@ucl.ac.uk, Matti.Lassas@helsinki.fi, gunther@math.washington.edu